DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 328 95 EA 007 244

AUTHOR	Sumner, Gerald C.; And Others
TITLE	Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. 3: The Process of Change. Appendix C: Innovations in Bilingual Education.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	R-1589/3-HEW(APP.C)
PUB DATE	Apr 75
NOTE	153p.; Related documents are ED 099 957, EA 007 240-247
AVAILABLE FROM	Rand Corp., 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, California 90406 ($7.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$8.24 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Adoption (Ideas); *Bilingual Education; Case Studies (Education); Change Agents; *Change Strategies; Diffusion; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; *State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; ESEA Title VII

ABSTRACT

This appendix deals with Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which funds bilingual education projects proposed by local school districts. Section 1 describes the origins and the planning and management strategies that the United States Office of Education adopted for this program. Section 2 describes the role of state education agencies. Section 3 presents syntheses of fieldwork case studies, which describes the similarities and differences found in the planning, implementation, and adaptation of each of the projects covered. It also attempts to generalize from the limited evidence. Section 4 presents the individual case studies for these bilingual education projects. (Author)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED108328

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FEDERAL PROGRAMS SUPPORTING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, VOL. III: THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

Appendix C. Innovations in Bilingual Education

PREPARED FOR THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

GERALD C. SUMNER
TODD I. ENDO
PETER W. GREENWOOD
BEVERLY J. HAWKINS
LAWRENCE McCLUSKEY
MARTA SAMULON
GAIL ZELLMAN

R-1589/3-HEW (APP. C)
APRIL 1975

$7.00

EA 007 244

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA. 90406

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract HEW-OS-73-216 with the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Views or conclusions contained in this study should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

PREFACE

Rand is conducting, under the sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education, a several-year study of federally funded programs designed to introduce and spread innovative practices in public schools. These change agent programs normally offer temporary federal funding to school districts as "seed money." If an innovation is successful, it is assumed that the district will continue and disseminate part or all of the project using other sources of funds. The Rand study examines four such federal change agent programs--Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III, Innovative Projects; Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title VII, Bilingual Projects; Vocational Education Act, 1968 Amendments, Part D, Exemplary Programs; and the Right-To-Read Program. The study identifies what tends to promote various kinds of changes in the schools and what doesn't; in particular, the Rand study will identify for federal, state, and local policymakers the nature, permanence, and extent of dissemination of innovations that are associated with the various federal programs and with various federal, state, and local practices.

A series of five reports describes the first-year results of the Rand study (July 1973 to July 1974):

Volume I (R-1589/1-HEW, A Model of Educational Change) provides a theoretical perspective for the Rand study by analyzing the current state of knowledge of planned change in education and by proposing a conceptual model of factors affecting change processes within school districts.[*]

Volume II (R-1589/2-HEW, Factors Affecting Change Agent Projects) contains the analysis of survey data collected by a national sample of 293 projects in 18 states during November and December 1973.

Volume III (R-1589/3-HEW, The Process of Change) summarizes the findings and policy implications resulting from 29 case studies of change agent projects conducted by Rand staff members and consultants in 25 school districts during April and May 1974. The case study sites, chosen from the original sample of 293 projects initially surveyed, represent a variety of project objectives and local district conditions. This report also describes the role of the state education agencies in selecting, managing, and disseminating change agent projects.

---

[*] Because of Rand's interest in advancing knowledge of organizational behavior in educational institutions, the research underlying this report was supported in part by an allocation of Rand corporate research funds.

Volume IV (R-1589/4-HEW, The Findings in Review) summarizes the findings of Vols. I, II, and III, and also synthesizes extensive data collected by Rand on federal-level program strategy and management for each of the change agent projects. Volume IV also includes a discussion of alternative federal strategies for promoting innovation.

Volume V (R-1589/5-HEW, Executive Summary) presents the study's methods and results for a general audience.

Subsequent research will collect additional data on Titles III and VII of ESEA, with particular focus on projects whose federal funding has expired.

This report is one of four appendixes to Vol. III. Each appendix deals with a different federal change program and brings together our first-year observations and findings at federal, state, and local levels. Appendix A deals with Title III, App. B with reading programs, App. C with bilingual education, and App. D with career education.

This appendix deals with Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which funds bilingual education projects proposed by local school districts. Section I describes the origins and the planning and management strategies that USOE adopted for this program.* Section II describes the role of state education agencies. Section III presents syntheses of our fieldwork case studies, which describe the similarities and differences we found in the planning, implementation, and adaptation of each of the projects covered. It also attempts to generalize from the limited evidence. Section IV presents the individual case studies for these bilingual education projects. In all cases, the names of states, school district projects, and people are fictitious. For some projects, facts and events are altered somewhat, but the essence of the project experience has been preserved. Each district that participated did so under a promise of anonymity; our respondents' frankness and cooperativeness testify to the merits of this guarantee in producing a fair picture of how these projects developed, with their various strengths and weaknesses.

Ideally, our work would include a synthesis to describe how interactions of federal, state, and local levels have shaped Title VII. Building on this synthesis, we could then recommend to policymakers at each level courses of action that taken together could improve the effectiveness of Title VII. But we had to settle, in view of time and resource limitations, for much less than this ambitious goal.

---

*This program description pertains to Title VII policies for FY 1973-74. FY 1974-75 policies employ somewhat different guidelines and terminology.

Instead, in this appendix we present our findings at each level of government in separate sections with little attempt to integrate the findings from different levels. That task is approached in Vol. IV of this series (R-1589/4-HEW, The Findings in Review), but cannot be pursued to its conclusion within the framework of the present study.

What we have produced in this appendix is a description of Title VII as it operates at the federal and state level, together with our description and analysis of factors that contribute to the strengths and weaknesses of selected Title VII projects as they actually operate in the setting of the schools. The implications of our findings for public policy are discussed more fully in Vol. IV.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

Section
I. TITLE VII OF ESEA: THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM I-1
  General Overview I-1
  Program Budget and Numbers of Projects I-2
  Program Strategy I-3

II. STATE EDUCATION AGENCY PARTICIPATION II-1
  SEA Interests II-1
  Criticisms of Federal Management II-2

III. SYNTHESIS OF CASE STUDIES III-1
  Issues Affecting Success of Title VII Projects III-2
  The Process of Change via Title VII Projects III-9

IV. CASE STUDIES IV-1
  West Bluff IV-3
  West Bay IV-23
  Metropolis IV-36
  Bay City IV-52
  Seaside IV-73
  Grand Fork IV-95

I. TITLE VII OF ESEA: THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM*

GENERAL OVERVIEW

This section gives a brief overview of the Title VII program to serve as a background for understanding the case studies of individual projects. The data included were obtained from interviews and program records.

The Title VII program was enacted in 1968 as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which was revised in that year. The legislation recognizes "the special educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States" and authorizes the establishment of programs to meet these needs. The program mandated a different educational approach for which there was little background in research and development and little experience in the schools. The Office of Education (OE) has spent the first five years of the program taking initial steps in formulating the philosophy and objectives of bilingual education; developing curricula for various language groups and many grade levels; providing in-service training for teachers in attitudes toward, and techniques in, bilingual education; devising new assessment techniques in bilingual education; and stimulating interest among local education agencies (LEAs) and state education agencies (SEAs). Of all the programs in the study, the state of the art with which the Title VII program began its activities was at the crudest stage of development.

The brief history of the Title VII program has been marked by a degree of turbulence and conflict that was unusual even in the unsettled conditions of the OE during these years. Perhaps because of the paucity of experience in the field, and the inherent controversy over the concept of bilingual education that involved national, political, and social forces, there has been considerable debate (which began on the day the program was created and continues unabated today) over (1) the philosophy and goals of the program, (2) the program's intervention strategy, and (3) the basic decisionmaking control. At various times, these three issues and innumerable related ones have caused conflict between the federal program office and top-level management in OE, between OE and Congress, among an organized special interest group and top-level decisionmakers in OE and the administration, and among members of the program office. These conflicts differ only in degree, not in kind, from those in the other programs in the study. However, the strength of emotions and opinions involved, the number of actors involved, and the frequency of disruptive incidents make this program unique.

---

*This program description pertains to Title VII policies for FY 1973-74. FY 1974-75 policies employ somewhat different guidelines and terminology.

The conflicts have impeded the development of coherence and clarity in a program that would have had difficulty in developing these qualities under the best of circumstances.

PROGRAM BUDGET AND NUMBERS OF PROJECTS

The budget of the bilingual education program has risen steadily, as indicated in Table 1, but only after a friendly Congress overruled administration requests to limit the program's growth.

In the first year of the program, FY 1969, the program funded 76 projects in 21 states, representing six languages with the $7.5 million appropriation. The majority of projects were located in California and Texas, and by far the largest number included Spanish-speaking children. Most projects had budgets exceeding $100,000 and, in accordance with the legislation, were sponsored by a LEA, a group of LEAs, or a LEA in conjunction with an institution of higher education. Projects were limited by the regulations to a maximum of five years of funding.

Table 2 shows how the total number of projects increased as the program budget grew. Since 1969, the proportion of grants to California and Texas dropped dramatically as the program made a conscious effort to support programs in new geographical areas. Also, by legislation and program policy, more language groups have been involved in the projects.

Table 1

AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR TITLE VII PROGRAM, ESEA
($ million)

Fiscal Year	Authorization	President's Request	Appropriation
1968	15	--	--
1969	30	5	7
1970	40	10	21
1971	80	21	25
1972	100	25	35
1973	135	Not Available	35
1974	135	35[a]	50[b]
1975	135	70	85

[a] The President's budget request for 1975 for the bilingual education program has recently been raised to $70 million mainly due to the anticipated effects of the Lau v. Nichols decision.

[b] In late FY 1974, an $8 million supplemental appropriation increased this figure to $58 million.

Table 2

NUMBER OF TITLE VII PROJECTS SUPPORTED

Fiscal Year	New Projects	Continuations	Total
1969	76	--	76
1970	59	72	131
1971	35	129	164
1972	46	164	210
1973	1[a]	208	209

[a] One project, discontinued in 1972, was reopened in 1973.

PROGRAM STRATEGY

The Title VII law targets the program to poor children between the ages of 3 and 18 and to states and areas within states with the greatest need for bilingual education programs, but is vague concerning the substance of the educational programs envisioned. A major debate within the program and between the program and the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation within OE has been over whether the goal of bilingual education is to maintain the language and culture that a pupil knows, as well as teach him English, or to help him make a transition to fluency in English through instruction in his native language. This conflict between a "transitional" versus "maintenance" goal has continued throughout the history of the program and at the date of this writing has not subsided.

In the first year of the bilingual program, the federal program office sent grants announcements and guidelines to SEAs, which then communicated with potential local applicants. In many cases, SEAs that found the OE guidelines lacking detail sent supplementary materials to LEAs. The federal program office provided no additional help in preparing proposals at this time. Applicants were required to submit a preliminary proposal of not more than ten single-spaced pages to both OE and the applicable SEA. Under the law, the SEAs could review the proposals and advise the federal program office on selections, but they had no formal power. SEAs considered the proposals and submitted ranked lists of their judgments to OE. During the selection process, the federal program office occasionally rejected highly ranked choices of SEAs, but rarely approved proposals judged unfavorably by them.

Great leeway was given to LEAs, allowing them to focus on the specific needs of their locality. Aside from the legislative language that "Title VII funds are available for exemplary pilot or demonstration projects," there was little in the early guidelines that indicated to prospective applicants that they would be participating in a nationwide effort to develop models of bilingual education that could be replicated. Also, the importance of the four components of instructional program, curriculum, community involvement, and staff development, which were explicitly urged on projects in a later year, were only implicit in these guidelines.

Thus, the initial guidelines for the Title VII program did not clearly focus or structure the program. LEAs could propose almost any educational project for the target population as long as two languages were used in instruction and the history and culture of the non-English language group was taught. Without the background or the time to conceptualize the program more carefully, the staff hoped that insights and better direction would emerge from experience in the field.

The second year, a number of program staff groups were set up to examine the previous year's proposals and projects in greater depth, to talk with expert consultants, and to think through possible approaches to advances in bilingual education. As a result of staff recommendations, a number of strategies were developed to conduct basic research and development work in bilingual education and to provide services to individual projects. First, a search was made of first-round projects with a specialized program focus that could be developed for use in other projects, and a staff capable of developing a "model." About a dozen of these "projects with a specialty" were given additional one-year grants ranging from $25,000 to $200,000. Second, a number of special projects were funded. Some of these were completed within one year or did not produce satisfactory results. The following four projects are still in operation and are an integral part of the program's strategy:

1. The Dissemination Center for Bilingual Education was set up for the systematic identification, assessment, refinement, and dissemination of existing materials in the areas of instructional curricula and equipment, community and parental involvement, staff development, instructional techniques and strategies, and evaluation designs. The existing center in Austin, Texas, took over after the initial effort in Fort Worth failed to operate effectively.
2. The Spanish Curriculum Core Project was funded to develop "a curriculum core designed for all Spanish-speaking students (Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and others)." It is currently being field-tested.

3. The Multilingual Assessment Project was designed to develop relevant testing instruments for the populations that did not speak English and to prepare "an annotated list of standardized tests that may be applicable to this population."
4. The Materials Acquisition Project was intended to collect instructional materials from abroad that could be used as supplementary materials in Title VII classrooms.

For these special projects, the program sought well-known persons and groups to develop the ideas and found compatible LEAs to accept the grants and house the projects.

By the third year, 1971, the program had achieved a somewhat greater degree of conceptual clarity, and published a major revision in the program manual that added further weight to the maintenance philosophy of bilingual education by stating that "it must be remembered that the goal of bilingual education is a student who functions well in two languages on any occasion."* Further, the manual argued for the equality of the two languages and cultures by emphasizing that "a complete program develops and maintains the children's self-esteem and a legitimate pride in both cultures."** Elsewhere, the manual supported the same position by stating that in a bilingual program "children whose dominant language is English are taught the dominant language of the other children," that "provision is made for increasing the instructional use of both languages for both groups in the same classroom," and that students who come from homes where English is not the dominant language should not be segregated from the rest of the school population.

Aside from the clarification of what constitutes a bilingual education program, the manual also provided some informal funding guidelines. After the first year, project and budget size could grow, but were limited to a vertical expansion in grade levels. For instance, if a program began with a kindergarten class in the first year, it was permitted to expand to a kindergarten and a 1st grade class the second year. This was to allow the development of a continuous program for the students. However, federal funds could not be used to expand the project horizontally -- for instance, to two or more kindergarten classes in the second year. After the third year of vertical expansion, LEAs were expected to absorb the cost of the most developed grade level. In our example, the LEA would assume the cost of the kindergarten program and the Title VII program would support the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grade programs. It was hoped that this method of funding would keep project costs within the budget, encourage the development of a continuous program, and encourage LEAs to assume gradually the cost of the program.

---

*Programs under Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA): Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees, DHEW, April 20, 1971, p. 2.

**Ibid., p. 1.

Thus, by the third year of the program, the staff had become somewhat more specific about the types of bilingual projects it should encourage. However, the program continued to rely on the imagination and ability of individual project staffs to develop good ideas into model programs. Besides making a tentative start in funding special centers and adding to the budgets of promising projects, the program staff did not seem to think systematically about how the federal dollars would affect a larger audience than the funded projects, nor what effect would be desirable. Individual staff members undertook activities aimed to help develop the field of bilingual education, but such efforts were sporadic. If there was an articulated program philosophy at this time, it was that OE could provide funds for the idea of bilingual education to develop, but once begun, the processes of change were so idiosyncratic or unknown that OE could do little to influence systematically the course of the development.

In more recent years, the program has not done much more to clarify and specify its overall intervention strategy.* Most program staff members have not been totally happy with their strategy, but they have been unable to delineate a better path. Much has happened to push the program in various directions, but the staff has initiated few of these changes.

The goals and strategies of the bilingual program at the state level are described in Sec. II.

---

*Our review of the bilingual program does not extend beyond April 1974.

II. STATE EDUCATION AGENCY PARTICIPATION*

SEA INTERESTS

SEA involvement with Title VII varies directly with the state's interest in bilingual education. In those states visited where bilingual education was a fairly low-priority issue, either because of the relatively small number of non-English-speaking people in the state or because of legislative disinterest in the problem, Title VII was handled in a rather cavalier fashion. By contrast, in states where there were large numbers of non-English speakers, Title VII was taken much more seriously. In other words, where the goals of Title VII dovetailed with the interests of the state, we would find a fully functioning Title VII staff, despite the fact that there are no federal funds given to the state for Title VII administration. In states where bilingual education was not a prime concern, responsibility for Title VII was allocated to some other SEA official, whose primary appointment was in some other area (Title I, Migrant Workers, Foreign Language Coordinator, etc.), and who attended to Title VII related issues spasmodically. The closeness of the relationship between state concern over bilingual education and attention to Title VII funding may be illustrated by two examples.

In one state, Title VII was monitored by a man who was on the Title I staff. The state made recommendations about Title VII to USOE, but their effect was minimal. This entire operation was described as "slipshod." However, when the state mandated bilingual education for all students needing it, the situation changed immediately. Currently, there are seven professionals on the Title VII staff who spend time making recommendations to USOE about Title VII funding.

In another state, which despite a fairly large proportion of non-English speakers had no bilingual education program, the Title III director would occasionally send Title VII proposals to the SEA's foreign language consultant for review. (This individual repeatedly raised the question of who was responsible for Title VII within the state, but was never given an answer. Apparently, the question could not be answered definitively since there was no one charged directly with such responsibility.) When the legislature mandated a bilingual program, a position of Title VII director was immediately created and filled. It seems clear that as the state's interest in bilingual education increases, the Title VII staff will grow.

---

*Based on telephone and personal interviews with program officers in eight states.

In states where bilingual education has been of major concern, a fully functioning Title VII staff is the rule. These people, despite the fact that they have no formal, direct authority over the funded LEAs, exercise much influence over Title VII programs in the state by means of various interpersonal linkages they have built up with both the LEAs and with Washington personnel. (One state, which has a fairly large Title VII staff, implicitly acknowledges the need for such linkages by including the notion of "public relations skills" in its Title VII hiring policy.)

Our interviews confirmed the existence of a national controversy over what Title VII funds should be used to accomplish. On one hand, Title VII officials see cultural plurality as the goal of the program; on the other, OE officials feel that Title VII funding should be used to help non-English speakers to become part of the American "mainstream."

This division of opinion over how Title VII funding should be used may be illustrated by comparing interviews in two states, both of which have Spanish-speaking populations. In both interviews, the respondents were native-born Americans of Spanish ancestry. One felt that establishing Spanish-American bi-culturalism for all students was necessary not only because it would ensure the continuance of the Spanish culture, but also because, in his view, the United States was rapidly becoming a Hispanic nation. He cited statistics dealing with the influx of Spanish-speaking peoples from Mexico, Puerto Rico, and South America.

A diametrically opposed view was put forth by his counterpart in another state. This individual seemed to feel that the maintenance of the Spanish culture would take care of itself ("I can drop any one of the Spanish-speaking kids in this state into Madrid, and he will be at home") and that the major purpose of Title VII should be to make the kids with a Spanish heritage proficient in English so that they could survive economically ("No one cares if you know the history of Spain and its glories; they want to know if you can read and write English to get a job").

From the above, it is apparent that as state interest in bilingual education grows, so will the size and scope of operations of the SEA Title VII staffs. Given the diversity of opinions among SEAs on the primary mission of Title VII (cultural pluralism versus mainstreaming of minorities), increased emphasis on the question of the nature of bilingual education may make this issue a major policy concern.

CRITICISMS OF FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

In criticizing the Title VII program and staff, the eight SEAs interviewed seem to split rather cleanly into West and East, and somewhat ambiguously into four regions: West, Midwest, East, and Southeast.

In the West, Title VII figures importantly in the SEAs' own agendas, and accordingly these SEAs devote considerable staff time for monitoring projects, including regular site visits, workshops, and the like. The SEAs' concerns are with providing training, responding to specific calls for assistance, expediting the flow of materials throughout the state, and assuring that projects conform to the intent of the Title VII guidelines. Although they do attempt to impose some degree of control over the projects, the SEAs in fact have no jurisdiction and must appeal to the federal Title VII office for action.

The main complaint of the Western SEAs is that there are too few site visits by the federal Title VII staff. They agree that the federal staff is very accessible by telephone and mail, but insist that greater site presence is necessary to really understand what is going on at the project level. This complaint reduces in large part to a desire for more effective control over projects. The Title VII LEA guidelines, broadly constructed to accommodate the needs of bilingual education in all states, are viewed as being too flexible to serve as an effective device for control. If a SEA wishes to reprimand a project and is not able to invoke the guidelines, it must appeal to the federal program office. The federal staff allegedly does not always follow SEA recommendations about punitive action (i.e., project determination) or selection of new projects; some federal resistance is said to be due to "political pressure."

In the East (and Midwest and Southeast), Title VII does not fit as importantly into the SEA scheme of things, and staff time is devoted to Title VII projects only when convenient in connection with funded bilingual projects (e.g., Title III, Title II-Migrant). No regular visitation is carried on at Title VII sites.

As in the West, the Eastern SEAs complain that there is too little site visitation by the federal program office. But where Westerners seemed mostly concerned with keeping projects in line, the Easterners felt that with greater site presence, federal officers would become more sensitive to the special needs of bilingual education in those states. Two respondents characterized Title VII as being a program designed for the West and Southwest, a Chicano program. One Midwestern respondent claimed that the dispersed nature of target populations in his area, in contrast with both East and West, presented special problems that are not recognized in the guidelines. Another respondent felt that Title VII needed more people--not for better supervision, but for more ideas. Another noted that more day-to-day assistance is needed (especially with respect to curriculum) and "more form and less format." Another stated, "The root of bilingual education problems is conventional or conservative teaching practices." As in the West, some complained that the federal staff is vulnerable to political influence, presumably with respect to Western bias as well as the selection of new projects.

III. SYNTHESIS OF CASE STUDIES

Gerald C. Sumner

Fieldwork was conducted at six Title VII sites in April and May 1974: two on the west coast, one in the Rocky Mountains, one in the Southwest, one in the Midwest, and one on the east coast. Three projects were in large urban school districts, one was in a suburb, one was in a small city, and one was in a rural area. The rural project was essentially a collection of five projects (in separate school districts) under collective management. One project has completed two years of operation; one, three years; two, four years; and two, five years.

One project serving grades K-12 has been a major facilitating device for the district's desegregation effort. One serves grades K-8 with three separate non-English groups, including two Indian tribes. One serves K-6 and is noteworthy because it is sure to continue after federal funding terminates. Another project also serving K-8 is noteworthy because of unorthodox project management. Another project also serving K-6 is noteworthy because the principal actors were largely responsible for state bilingual legislation, although the Title VII project itself will probably succumb after federal funding ends. The sixth district serves grades K-4 and is enjoying the most obvious success at classroom level, probably through aggressive implementation tactics.

Judging from the six fieldwork sites, Title VII projects don't show as much variation in success as would be expected from other kinds of federally funded programs. This is because there is usually more congruence with attendance area needs, if not district objectives. Also, Title VII projects usually deal

DESCRIPTION OF CASE STUDY SITES

West Bluff, a town of 7000 located in a sparsely populated section of a western state, is a center for farming, ranching, mining, light lumber, and tourism. It has a long-established Spanish heritage population and significant numbers of Indians.

West Bay is in an agricultural area of a coastal western state. Approximately one-third of its 32,000 population is predominantly low-income Mexican-American. A controversial busing program is integrating the schools.

Metropolis is a large industrial city in the Southwest. It ships petroleum products, cotton, and lumber, and manufactures chemical, steel, and electronic and geophysical equipment. Metropolis has rarely experienced the Chicano militancy of other southwest areas.

Bay City is a large seaport city on the East Coast. The school district, now under reorganization, has been beset with racial strife.

Seaside is a large western city and a major industrial center. Its Spanish-speaking population is predominantly Mexican-American and is concentrated in one area.

Grand Fork is a city of approximately 150,000 in a midwestern state. The community is 88 percent white and 11.3 percent black. The latino population includes émigrés from a number of Spanish-speaking countries. It is a manufacturing center, principally business machinery, auto parts, chemicals, and paper products.

comprehensively with the student's classroom experience (at least in elementary grades), the target group is very identifiable, and target group needs have sociopolitical flavor as well as educational. Under these conditions, Title VII projects are typically very visible, making it difficult to subvert project objectives.

The term "bilingual education" will be used to denote the sort of program funded by Title VII; that is, projects that have a strong cross-cultural (or bicultural) component, that are not necessarily restricted in number of grade levels served, and typically serve native English speakers as well as native non-English speakers. These projects contrast with programs where the single purpose is to provide native non-English speakers with communication skills in English, programs such as ESL (English as a Second Language), and the limited transition-oriented bilingual programs typically prescribed by state legislation. Bilingual instruction is used in the latter type, but only so that development of non-language related skills will not be retarded. In contrast, Title VII projects are also primarily concerned with the affective domain (e. g. , self-concept, socialization), and to a lesser extent with maintenance of cultural pluralism.

The discussion is in two parts. One describes issues that are important to the success of Title VII projects, and one describes how these issues affect the various stages of the change model (initiation, implementation, etc.) proposed in Vol. I. Although the fieldwork at the six sites provides the main source of information, the discussion generalizes freely across the universe of Title VII projects on topics where we have found corroboration from other sources. We feel that by stretching our findings and interpretations in light of other experience, more useful policy insight is obtained than would result from a strict summary of observations in the six sites.

ISSUES AFFECTING SUCCESS OF TITLE VII PROJECTS

Variability of Needs

Languages and Language Skills. The needs of target populations served by Title VII projects vary markedly across the country. The most obvious differences have to do with language type and language skills.

Most of the projects (about 150) serve populations whose dominant culture is Spanish. The remaining 60 projects are divided among 20 or so language groups. Projects that serve languages of low incidence have few commercially available materials to rely on and must be mostly self-sufficient with respect to materials development and staff training. Even in the largest language group, Spanish, dialect differences frustrate the widespread use of most materials. In many cases, several dialect/culture groups are represented in the same project, making it especially difficult to utilize a uniform materials list.

The other important dimension relating to language differences has to do with abilities to communicate in English or the native language. The project may serve some students who are monolingual English, some who are monolingual in another language, some who can reasonably communicate in both languages, and some who have difficulty communicating in either. In most projects there are few students who are not native English speakers; and the primary purposes then are to teach the other language and to provide a cross-cultural experience.

SES. There are also differences in socioeconomic status (SES) between projects, and differences in lengths of time that the families of target students have resided in the United States. These differences may affect the kind of services provided by the project. For example, on the east coast, where there are many newly arrived Puerto Rican émigrés, some projects provide certain kinds of practical instruction not provided in the homes, such as how to use subways, park facilities, public health services, etc. Projects may also attempt to provide parents with the same service.

Target Group Density. Finally, there are important differences relating to residential patterns. In the West, Southwest, and many Eastern cities, target groups for bilingual projects are largely concentrated in barrios or certain neighborhoods. This offers the advantage of scale economies. The numbers of target students warrant schoolwide programs, or at least full classrooms. There is also likely to be a range of social services directed at the target group by nonschool agencies. Concentrations of non-English speakers provide corresponding non-English communities, so that target students can survive in the barrio while learning English. In the Midwest and in rural areas of other parts of the country, target populations are more dispersed and project funds must therefore be spread more thinly, both in terms of geography and kinds of services provided. At the same time, the need for speaking and writing English may be more urgent because there is no barrio, and there is not likely to be bilingual personnel in stores, government offices, hospitals, etc.

Community Involvement

Title VII guidelines specify that projects should have advisory councils that include parents of target youngsters and community representatives. The involvement of these councils varies widely from project to project. Some councils' functions are purely ceremonial, whereas others seem to actually contribute to policy. One tentative generalization from the fieldwork is that effective community action is rare among parents who are not native English speakers. Active advisory councils are typically manned by community activists or Anglo parents. District officials do not necessarily view the active advisory council as a blessing, especially when community and district do not see eye to eye on issues of project implementation. From the district standpoint, such a council may greatly impede progress toward district goals.

Instruction

Instructional Models. Title VII projects have been mostly on their own in developing models for instruction. There has been very little sharing of what project personnel regard as relevant information in this regard. In most cases, Title VII has required that projects start with kindergarten and grade 1, then go up one more grade level each year; the details of curriculum, scheduling, and staffing patterns are generally left to the local staff. There have been complaints, incidentally, about the Title VII "vertical expansion" model; this approach gives the district less experience with upper grades, where development problems are allegedly more difficult.

Although there does seem to be considerable use of such innovations as team teaching, pull-out groups, and flexible scheduling, there were complaints that bilingual education provides little in the way of innovative teaching practice. This is largely because most instruction formats have been home-grown, with little influence from outside. ESL teachers usually develop the materials, and they have not typically had much experience in classroom innovation; the fact that languages other than English are employed at all in classrooms may seem innovative. Another view is that the low level of innovation stems from the fact that Title VII has been oriented to the West and Southwest, where attitudes toward bilingual education are alleged to be more paternalistic and less change oriented than in other areas. A third view is that certain classroom innovations that require a larger measure of student independence, such as open classrooms and contingency management, are incongruent with bilingual target groups; some say the incongruence stems from cultural differences, others say that it stems from the fact that most target youngsters come from families where there is relatively little complementary educational experience.

Bilingual programs for junior and senior high school students have had rough sledding. Instruction in the secondary grades is typically departmentalized rather than provided in self-contained classrooms. Unless the project is large relative to the size of the school, there may not be enough resources to provide for flexible scheduling. The situation is aggravated by the fact that students in these age groups typically do not want to be identified with a special program that marks them as being different or in need of remedial instruction. One project is attacking this stigma by expanding to encompass the school's regular foreign language curriculum, thereby snaring a sizable proportion of college-bound students. Another project actively recruits the most popular students, in the belief that other students will follow.

Another source of special problems is SSL (Spanish as a Second Language). Title VII has required, with mixed success, that bilingual projects be integrated (i.e., that project participants represent all ethnic groups that exist in the respective school populations). Even without integration, however, many participants are native English speakers. In such cases, SSL is theoretically as important to the success of the bilingual program as ESL. Nevertheless, SSL is consistently weak, mostly due to lack of enthusiasm on the part of both staff and students. Motivation for instruction in languages other than Spanish and English might be even lower.

Materials. Most project directors said that commercially available bilingual materials are generally unusable without significant adaptation. This reflects the diversity of target populations. Consequently there has been much apparently redundant local materials development and little systematic exploitation of the fact by Title VII. Because there is so much local development, it probably should not be surprising that very little of it represents technological innovation. This is ironic because bilingual education would seem to be a logical setting for an individualized prescriptive/diagnostic curriculum.* Some bilingual educators are wary of existing individualized curricula, which they characterize as "learning at your own speed" and ignoring other dimensions of needs variability.

Many project staffs consider that available standardized test instruments are inadequate. English language tests are culturally biased, and tests for other language groups are not available or are technically deficient.

---

*If this were done, care would have to be exercised to assure that the individualized aspects do not in fact lead to completely separate classroom experiences for children with different language dominance. This appeared to be the case in one program that was utilizing an individualized remedial reading and math curriculum.

Staff

Recruitment. There is a severe undersupply of teachers whom project directors identify as "bilingually qualified." The supply of teachers who match target students on ethnicity is even more desperate.

There is considerable recruitment from out of state, especially in the West and Midwest; Texas and the Southwest are considered the prime sources for new teachers.

In some areas, particularly the Midwest, there is next to no supply of local talent. If a project must rely entirely on external recruitment, chances are high that the staff will be career-centered rather than place-centered, and staff turnover rates will be high. These recruitment and turnover problems are aggravated by competition from other school districts, other careers, and university graduate programs.

State mandates for bilingual education, which are typically for short-term transition-oriented programs, also may be having a perverse effect on the more comprehensive cross-cultural bilingual programs funded under Title VII. Some districts are considering pirating the voluntary federally funded programs in order to accumulate sufficient staffing for the state-mandated programs.

Finally, pressures for rapid expansion of bilingual demonstration projects (such as those funded under Title VII) may similarly have a negative effect in that available bilingual staff will be spread more thinly, with a corresponding weakening of the various projects.

Some informants suggested that the teacher supply crisis, while severe, has been overrated in certain places. Community informants complained that district recruiters "don't know where to look," which was a polite way of claiming that districts are reluctant to go outside established channels, are over-apprehensive about recruiting at colleges where students are militant, or are using the shortage as a ruse to protect the jobs of existing monolingual staffs. A few district officials have in turn complained that it would be easier to recruit teachers with special qualifications (e.g., bilingualism) if there were less preoccupation with accreditation at local, state, and federal levels.

Training. If there are sufficient numbers of willing candidates for the bilingual teaching profession, then training is the bottleneck. Fieldwork informants were constantly making pleas for bilingual training programs. Existing university programs were criticized for inadequate treatment of other languages as mediums of classroom instruction. Some advocated government funding of a system of regional training centers to decrease dependence on interstate recruitment. Others advocated expanded pre-service/in-service programs to take advantage of local talent. One western project, for example, is situated in the midst of a very large Chicano population. Project teachers are required to pass a Spanish proficiency examination. Some Chicano applicants, who rely on the somewhat repressed Spanish of their natural backgrounds, don't do well on the test. Middle-class Anglos, who have the advantage of university Spanish-language training and frequent visits to Spanish-speaking countries, do better.

Intra-Staff Relations. There is frequent resistance toward bilingual projects among regular staff. The resistance generally reflects differences in opinion about the worth of bilingual education as compared with the simpler ESL approach, but also mirrors real or imagined threats to monolingual regular staff. In one project it was made clear from the beginning that monolingual teachers of specific grade levels would be transferred out each year; after the initial near-revolt, the regular staff acquiesced to the inevitable, and actually became more supportive than regular staff at projects where the future of the bilingual requirement was left ambiguous.

Even at district staff level, unknown agendas and attitudes stand in the way of "well-meaning" persons of similar purpose. This happens where project administrators are of the same ethnicity as the target students, but regular district officers are of some other ethnicity (e. g. , Anglo). In such cases, the project managers' zeal may chafe the more traditional sensibilities of old-line officers. Such zeal seems to be more welcome when project management acts out Anglo appearance and behavior. This situation may reflect ethnic prejudice, but it is probable that the greater influence is simply that persons of like ethnicity tend to be more successful in their interpersonal relationships.

Materials development in bilingual education projects has been dependent on the almost universal willingness of project teachers to devote many hours of their own time. Unfortunately, such zeal may be transitory. In the past, bilingual projects have been largely staffed by a rather elite group with a high sense of commitment to bilingual education, either through self-selection or a Hawthorne effect. As bilingual education becomes more commonplace and as training programs are forced to recruit more broadly in order to create an adequate supply of teachers, bilingual teachers may become as reluctant to spend their own time as are other teachers.

Legislative and Court Influence

Recent legislative and court action targeted at populations served by Title VII projects may actually impede the progress of cross-cultural bilingual education. In Lau v. Nichols (January 1974), the U.S. Supreme Court directed San Francisco public schools to provide "appropriate relief" to non-English-speaking children to provide them with educational access that is equal to that of English speakers. The court was not specific as to remedy, but suggested the alternatives of (1) ESL or (2) providing regular instruction in the non-English language. The impact of the ruling has yet to disseminate through federal education policy, but in the meantime, several states have independently legislated compulsory bilingual instruction.

The court ruling does not necessarily imply bilingual education, and the state mandates typically require transition programs only in the early primary grades. The purposes of either dictate will be weakened if attempts are made to implement them universally before there are enough qualified teachers. Staffs of more comprehensive bilingual projects such as those funded by Title VII would be pirated. This already seems to be the case in two Title VII sites that were visited.

The state mandates differ from Title VII projects several ways. Fewer grade levels would be served; there would be less emphasis on cross-cultural experiences; and programs would be restricted to students who have difficulty communicating in English. Many Title VII project staffs and advisory councils actually advocate bilingual programs devoted exclusively to native non-English-speaking students (although they are not pleased with the much narrower target of the state-mandated programs). There was much grumbling when in 1972 Title VII required that funded projects be integrated with native English speakers. The complaint is that resources are thereby diverted away from the primary target group; since the bilingual needs of native English speakers are different from those of native non-English speakers, it is much harder to run the projects. On the other hand, most people we interviewed agree that the separatist approach limits the effectiveness of the cross-cultural aspects of bilingual education, and generally prolongs effects associated with segregation.

One superintendent said that years hence he might be a target for a segregation suit because Title VII project students, who are widely dispersed in his district, are bused to a single school in order to assemble enough students to warrant the Title VII project. In another district, an inner city school principal was helpful in providing the Title VII project with facilities somewhat insulated from the regular program; since very few of the Title VII participants are native English speakers, Title VII in that district may be conveniently congruent with a private agenda for reducing strife by separating ethnic groups.

At the LEA level, in contrast to state and federal levels, there seems to be no vigorous debate over the relative merits of transition orientation versus plural-culture maintenance. Confronted by the hard facts of budget and availability of bilingual staff, the question usually is What can be done with available resources to improve on the basic transition approach?

THE PROCESS OF CHANGE VIA TITLE VII PROJECTS

Initiation

In four of the six Title VII sites that we visited, the superintendent's office initiated the project. In two of these four sites, a key district officer prepared the original proposal to Title VII with some consultation from other district staff. In another site, a committee of district staff wrote the proposal with some input from organized community meetings. In a fourth district, a joint committee of district and community representatives wrote the proposal.

In a fifth district, independent initiatives arose from district and community, and the two formed an uneasy alliance to write the proposal. In the sixth district, the initiative came from a self-organized ad hoc committee of social workers and junior district administrators.

Most sites used consultants to write proposals after planning grants were awarded.

Given the particular site characteristics, the mode of initiation was appropriate in most sites. However, the case where there were independent initiatives from community and district experienced a tumultuous year of disagreement and contradictory vested interest until the district successfully neutralized the opposition.

In all cases, the project was initiated because Title VII offered funding, and would not have been undertaken otherwise. On the other hand, in most sites the needs of the target students would have been addressed anyway, if only with an ESL project. The Title VII projects seem to be more successful in attaining their objectives where the district does have a prior commitment. Where such commitment is weak, bilingual education seems to have little public support, but the need is ironically often greatest. Independent commitment, where it exists, usually relates at least in part to the national influence of Title VII on the growth of bilingual education.

Implementation

The following factors seem to have had the most impact on the quality of implementation:

1. Staff training, both in universities prior to recruitment, and in project pre-service and in-service. It is generally better for teaching staff to be bilingual and well trained in bilingual pedagogy.
2. Staff ethnicity. There is some debate over whether the ethnicity of project staff should match that of target students, but it probably is not as important as some proponents argue because ethnics and non-ethnics adapt to their roles differently. At project management level, it may be better to match ethnicity with that of district management if the latter is resistant to project goals.
3. Commitment to project goals. This is almost as important for regular staff as for project staff.
4. The success of project staff in adapting materials.
5. Integration of the project at school building level. It is generally better for the project to be a part of the school physically, organizationally, and emotionally.
6. Facilities.
7. Pacing of implementation. One district seemed to try to institutionalize the management of its project from the very beginning and ran into difficulties that might not have occurred with slower implementation and heavy staffing at management level. Given the district's particular shortages of money and facilities, the project badly needed its own special advocates.
8. Characteristics of project director. The personal characteristics and abilities of the project director are very important, but it is not appropriate to try to generalize on what those characteristics should be. Different project directors have different styles, and different styles are more effective in different school districts. It is probably safe to say that commitment and energy are always helpful, but the value of charisma, for example, is probably overrated. One informant argued that the more

charisma, the more likely the project will be personally identified with the project director, and the less likely the project will persist when the project director leaves.

9. On-site project management. It appears to be very important for the project director to spend time in the school building. Where this is impractical, the person in charge at the building level should be locally influential. In one project, some project classrooms were over an hour's drive from project headquarters and rarely were visited by the project director. In this same project, school level project management at some sites was entirely the responsibility of instructional aides. The aides were well qualified for the substance of the program, but could not fight the Anglo school board and the certificated egos of the regular teaching staff.
10. Community involvement. It is popular to argue the importance of community involvement, but we have observed instances where strong community involvement was a detriment, at least from the district administration point of view. As noted above, active community advisory councils tend not to be composed of parents, but of community activists who are often aiming at political change. On the other hand, at one site the project director was aggressively utilizing these sociopolitical agendas to assure project continuance from a somewhat indifferent school district administration.

Probably one of the most important factors is overall timing. The notion of bilingual education as some kind of national education priority is fairly new, dating back only five or six years. The sense of acceptability, let alone priority, is filtering down to the LEAs at different rates. Thus there is a LEA readiness factor that may be independent of needs.

The relatively recent emergence of widespread bilingual education also suggests that some of our observations on the vanguard Title VII projects may become less relevant in the future for bilingual education as such, but will remain as appropriate considerations for other sorts of sweeping educational reform. It is not simply that bilingual education will pass through its period of increasing acceptability, but that some characteristics (such as cross-cultural emphases) may actually decline in favor, notwithstanding bilingual education's identifiable and increasingly powerful constituency.

Some inhibiting factors have been observed that in particular seem to make bilingual programs unfeasible. Resistance from among the native English-speaking community is one of the most significant; unfortunately the effective need is often greatest where such resistance is strong. Less frequently, there is also resistance from the native non-English-speaking community, who may regard bilingual education as a step backward. Another factor is resistance from regular staff, both at school and district levels. This may stem from intellectual disagreement, or apprehension over the possibility of losing influence or even jobs. Even when all staff are in agreement over project purposes, there is often a degree of conflict that emerges from relatively minor issues of implementation. At many sites it appears that the project would have benefited technically as well as behaviorally had the teachers been effectively tapped as a planning resource, particularly in areas of basic curriculum and evaluation design.

Turnover of project staff is another inhibiting factor. In many regions of the country, project staffs tend to be career-bound, for reasons that have already been discussed. With the existing shortage of qualified bilingual personnel, these staffs are particularly vulnerable to pirating by other careers, Ph. D. programs, other districts, or even promotion within the same district.

A final factor that should be mentioned is the dispersion of the target group. Midwestern projects are under considerable burden because residences of target students tend to be thinly dispersed. Sometimes dispersion is artificially introduced through desegregation, which hinders project administration despite the social benefits.

Continuation

Congruence with district needs is a prerequisite for continuance of bilingual programs after Title VII funding terminates, but needs should not be confused with district objectives, which are probably more decisive to the question. Another decisive factor is program cost and the district's fiscal situation. Desegregated bilingual programs are especially expensive because the disparate needs of students within each classroom require much more intensive staffing than in regular classrooms.

Even if the district has money and wants to adopt bilingual programs, continuation may still fall afoul of various factors discussed under implementation. A program will be better equipped to withstand such effects if the district has carefully planned for its institutionalization when outside funding terminates. Institutionalization is more than a change in who pays; it also usually shifts program management from the district's special programs division to the regular instruction division. Two of the Title VII sites we visited have dealt explicitly with this problem, but with contrasting strategies.

In one district, the transition to regular instruction is anticipated as early as the initial proposal for initial funding. The staff of the regular instruction division has the responsibility for the original program design in order to assure that it will incorporate smoothly with the regular instruction program; this staff then prepares the initial proposal for federal funding. The special programs division coordinates the proposal preparation, then administers the program when funding is granted. Toward the end of federal funding, the regular instruction division begins to take on increasing responsibility for the project, especially in the areas of curriculum and scheduling. The roles of the project director and his staff increasingly become those of expeditors, at least in theory. For the Title VII project at this site, this change-over process was accidentally facilitated when the project director was promoted, leaving the project in the hands of acting management during the final year of Title VII funding.

In another district, the attitude seemed to be that the regular instruction division, particularly at the school building level, is too burdened by logistical tasks to administer properly special programs, including bilingual education. The feeling is that such programs need advocates who can monitor their special needs and effectively cut through district protocol and red tape. In this district, many special educational programs remain the responsibility of the special program division after federal funding terminates. It should be noted, however, that some teachers in this district seemed to be at near-revolt because of the many special programs over which they or their principals seem to have little operational control; the large number of pull-out programs makes it difficult to organize a coordinated classroom program.

In a third district, a project director was aggressively pursuing his own strategy, one not particularly sanctioned by official district policy. His approach is to stimulate the target community's awareness of its political potential in general and of the project's worth in particular. To this end he engages in many activities not directly related to educational purposes, much to the distaste of some district officials. He is running considerable personal professional risk, but feels that if he is successful, the school board will not venture to discontinue the program after Title VII funding ends. He is also adamant about discouraging future funding from any but local sources.

Dissemination

External. There seemed to be very little evidence of dissemination of project models from one district to another. There did seem to be dissemination of the bilingual education idea, but not of particular operating characteristics. What is being disseminated, then, is acceptance of a controversial idea, not information on innovative instructional technique.

As was noted before, instructional models are typically home-grown. There seems to be an inordinately weak flow of ideas among bilingual projects, despite Title VII funding of special projects for that purpose. It is not clear whether these efforts are completely inadequate or whether projects are simply too parochial in their search for information. One factor may be that districts, at the time of project inception, are too inexperienced with bilingual education, and only find out about sources after most of the planning is completed.

Internal. There is much more dissemination within districts than between them, especially within larger districts where Title VII projects serve only a small proportion of target students. In three sites, Title VII projects have had a major influence on development of other projects within the district by sharing the benefits of staff training, management experience, materials, and experience with different instructional model characteristics (such as staffing patterns and pupil scheduling).

Title VII has also provided these larger districts administrative training for dealing with this still rather novel educational intervention. This important aim of internal dissemination can be expected to decrease in value if and when bilingual education becomes more of a fixture in U. S. education, and when inter-district flow of information on the subject loosens up.

Some element of political action is often the vehicle for dissemination, be it local lobbying or state legislation. The initiators of one Title VII project were largely responsible for the successful promotion of mandated bilingual education, first at the local level, then at the state level.

Federal Program Management

The universal complaint against federal programs in general had to do with the funding cycle. Many states require LEAs to formalize commitments to staff early in the spring preceding the school year, often months before federal programs announce their funding grants. This works a particular hardship on small districts that do not have the organizational slack that large districts do.

The federal Title VII program office in particular is generally felt to be remote, mostly in terms of awareness of project needs. Some projects are happy with this arrangement because it leaves them freer to shape the project to their will. Others, with fewer on-site resources, would prefer more guidance. The program office occasionally makes budget disallowances which are especially irksome because of their seeming arbitrariness. The eastern and midwestern projects are concerned about the program office's remoteness because of the program's traditional focus on the West and Southwest. It is felt that the guidelines are too rigid, considering the "small" funding levels, and that the unique needs of the East and Midwest are not well accommodated. Projects from all regions complain that turnover among project monitors is too high to establish adequate understanding of needs of particular sites.

Title VII has often provided consultants for technical assistance at the time of project initiation. Project informants have commended those consultants who provided assistance in the area of project administration, but instructional and curriculum consultants have been disappointing. Many project members have said that they were better off seeking their own consultants, or in following up on SEA recommendations.

Working relationships with SEAs are typically better than with the federal program office, although SEAs receive no money from Title VII. The SEA role depends on its own initiative, and varies from lending advice and recommending technical consultants to organizing site visits and regional workshops at its own expense.

One concern, having more to do with general government influence than with federal program management, was that legislation and court decisions directed at expediting social change often aggravate the orderly progress of that change, at least in the education sector. The problem is that public expectations make quantum leaps, and legal avenues are opened up through which the expectations can be expressed. Instead of being able to plot a strategic course that paces educational change, district administrators often must preside over a change process that is actually a series of tactical maneuvers and holding actions.

IV. CASE STUDIES

WEST BLUFF IV-3
Project ROS IV-3
Initiation IV-4
Implementation IV-5
State and Federal Relations IV-7
Sylmar School District IV-8
West Bluff School District IV-13
Summary and Conclusions IV-16
Annex: Comments on the Program IV-20

WEST BAY IV-23
The LEA IV-23
Project Initiation IV-24
Original Project Characteristics IV-26
Implementation IV-27
Bilingual Steering Committee IV-31
Summary and Conclusions IV-32

METROPOLIS IV-36
Local Education Agency IV-36
Current Project Characteristics IV-38
Initiation IV-40
Implementation IV-41
Parent/Community Involvement IV-45
State and Federal Relations IV-46
Program Impacts IV-46
Future Prospects IV-47
Summary and Conclusions IV-49

BAY CITY IV-52
The LEA IV-52
Current Project Characteristics IV-57
Initiation IV-60
Implementation IV-60
Dissemination/Continuation IV-67
Comments on Bilingual Education Issues IV-70

SEASIDE IV-73
Introduction IV-73
Program Content IV-75
Mechanics of the Program IV-82
Political Environment IV-85
Summary Comments IV-87
Annex: Suggested Schedules for Seaside Federal Title VII Program IV-90

GRAND FORK IV-95
The LEA IV-95
Current Project Characteristics IV-97
Initiation IV-98
Implementation IV-101

Future Prospects IV-108
Summary and Conclusions IV-111
Annex: On Issues Related to Bilingual Education IV-116

WEST BLUFF

Gerald C. Sumner and Marta Samulon

Project ROS serves several school districts. We conducted fieldwork at two sites and at project headquarters, consuming six person-days. The primary informant was a career-bound project director in his early thirties who has held that post for two years.

In many respects, the experience with Project ROS has varied from district to district. For this reason, the overall project discussion is followed by more specific site discussions. Other informants will be listed at the beginning of the site discussions.

PROJECT ROS

Project ROS is administered by a Board of Cooperative Services (BOCES), a cooperative organized to seek funding and administer special education projects for several counties. The area served is sparsely populated; some counties contain only two or three schools. The power base is Anglo, but has a long-established Spanish heritage (Mexicano) population, and significant numbers of Indians.

Project ROS administers bilingual education programs in three counties. There is little similarity among the programs. Some schools teach English and Indwan, and some teach English and Indtoo. The project began with kindergarten four years ago, and has thus far formally expanded to include all kids in grades K-3 in the respective schools. Three schools, however, utilize their assigned project resources to include all elementary grade levels.

Most schools are budgeted for an "itinerant teacher." Co-instructors (non-certificated bicultural teachers) are assigned to all schools. In most schools, the bilingual programs are run by the itinerant teachers, but co-instructors run the show in two.

The central Project ROS office at BOCES also employs the project director, a media specialist, an evaluation assistant who collects material for evaluation at the different sites, a linguist who is working on a written form for the use of the Indtoo language, and a secretary.

The project also has hired an external evaluation team. An evaluation auditor conducts an audit of the activities of the evaluator four times each year. The evaluators provide a summative evaluation with pre- and post-testing, and they also provide feedback to Project ROS with respect to monthly objectives. There is an in-service training program that meets every six weeks on Saturdays at the BOCES headquarters.

Project ROS formally has three community representatives--one for each ethnic group. There are also parent advisory groups at each site. There are no Indians on any of the school boards where project sites are located. One Indtoo ran for the school board in West Bluff last year but lost even though the Indtoos were dominant in his precinct.

The project director says that there has been quite a bit of community resistance to Project ROS, and he believes that this is partly rooted in prejudice, but also relates to lack of understanding of the nature and worth of bilingual education. The Anglos seem to think that the funds are misspent; that the kids ought to be spending their time learning English, not Indian languages. The Indians, on the other hand, are gratified that their languages are being taught; but they are also reticent, because until very recently the Indian languages were suppressed in the schools. Now Indians see the schools turning 180 degrees in attitude, and they are a little suspicious. Some are afraid of the change; they are afraid that bilingual education may be a step backward in the sense that schools more readily accept an English-speaking child than one who is bilingual. The Indtoo Indians in one community are reluctant to share their heritage because in the past they have been exploited.

The project director believes that most people accept the program now, but that district personnel remain reluctant. He says he tries to stay out of politics because that would make the project vulnerable. He tries to concentrate his attention on the specific needs of the program. His staff is a service organization, and attempts to pressure districts would limit or completely close channels of communication. He says that he is very concerned that when he tears down old barriers he does not erect new ones.

INITIATION

Prior to Project ROS, BOCES had established a Title III multicultural center. This was a service-oriented consulting facility, and there was no bilingual education in the schools at that time. The superintendents met at BOCES when Title VII funding first became available five years ago. Some of the superintendents felt that there was no need for bilingual education in the area, but others disagreed. The superintendents asked the BOCES director to prepare a proposal. Rather than a strictly bilingual program they wanted one with more emphasis on character development and multiculture.

The existing multiculture center had never jelled, perhaps because its objectives were rather vague and subject to many different interpretations; in the Title VII project, the superintendents wanted a program with fixed objectives, as they felt this would make it easier to implement and incorporate into the regular school program. Another special concern was for establishing an in-service training program. The teachers didn't want one, but one of the superintendents claimed that this attitude reflected a reluctance to find out about their own lack of sensitivity.

The original proposal was developed by two Indian laymen from the West Bluff district who worked with two or three superintendents, the BOCES evaluation staff, and a consultant firm, which actually wrote the proposal.

In the beginning the project designers were hesitant but the BOCES director pushed. They weren't sure that school boards and teachers would accept such a program, and they weren't sure about the Anglo reaction. According to one of the original proposal developers, there was a selling job to do, but acceptance of the program seemed to grow almost by itself. He says it is hard to say whether the program has accomplished the original objectives because in the beginning they weren't sure what their objectives were.

IMPLEMENTATION

The first director was a man from outside the state, and allegedly did not know the area well enough to understand its needs. He was terminated after one year. An interim project director did an excellent job, according to the current director; however, because she was an Anglo she was open to the usual criticisms of insensitivity and of inability to understand minority perspectives. After one year, the position was assumed by the present director.

According to one of the project designers, it took a while to get a working program together. They were slow in getting the necessary people interested and involved. They had to evaluate and make changes every year.

In the beginning the project staff in each of the several sites received the same kind of information, which was rather limited according to the former project director. They received lists of concepts and a general staffing pattern. But they received no materials, and each site went its own way in developing its specific model. At first the project focused on differences between the different ethnic groups but now the stress is more on similarities.

Another problem at first was that objectives were not followed closely. Now the project runs everything by objectives, and reportedly works much better. The objectives for K-3 lead directly from the proposal, but the sites serving upper grade levels make up their own objectives for those grades. There are six major objectives per month. Lately, however, there have been problems with the computer facility which the evaluator uses to monitor objectives. They usually send out computer printouts which indicate each student's progress along several objectives, but lately they have run far behind; teachers must develop their own interpretation of the proposal in order to articulate objectives.

The present evaluation structure was incorporated into the program only in the middle of the 1973-74 school year. Before that, the project used evaluation money to hire resource teachers who did the evaluation on site. The project director didn't like this procedure, mostly because resource teachers don't have the formal training that he feels is required for evaluation. He is chagrined that the project has waited until the middle of the fourth year for a professional evaluation.

Over the past four years the concept of what bilingual education ought to be in the West Bluff area has changed radically. Originally they were focusing on the typical Title VII concept that bilingual education ought to be concentrated on kids who are monolingual in languages other than English. This had to change because the target groups would never be able to accept this concept. There came a rapid awareness of the need to meet directly the needs of four target groups of students: (1) bilingual, (2) English-only, (3) non-English, and (4) English-speaking, with understanding in another language. The project now emphasizes the two minority cultures (Indwan and Indtoo), but the Anglo culture is also stressed, lest the pendulum swing too far. The director feels that the Anglos need the program in order to learn to understand their classmates and to understand other cultural communities.

The project director believes that the biggest benefit of the program has to do with the students' self-concept. The students are uncomfortable when the schools do not meet their needs, he says, and it is difficult to build rapport, to motivate them, and finally to teach them. He believes there are no universal models for bilingual education because specific needs vary so much from site to site. However, the implementation of a bilingual project probably shouldn't be as difficult as people think, since there are a lot of tools and wherewithal already in a school that can be utilized (materials, teacher training); it is largely a matter of logical thinking in how you orient and use these tools: Before you can hope to be effective in the conventional educational objective, there are prior needs for nutrition, shelter, and especially for self-concept. By focusing on individual needs, the school system can enhance self-concept, and ultimately the learning experience.

STATE AND FEDERAL RELATIONS

In his opinion, Title VII tends to send project directives that reveal obvious ignorance of the needs and characteristics of the project and the target population of the project.

The West Bluff superintendent reported that over the four years, Project ROS has changed drastically because of directives from the federal Title VII program office and also because of their budget disallowances. He says that these directives have often been very vague and that on several occasions the West Bluff district has gone through the planning and implementation of some feature only to be later told by Title VII that that feature should be eliminated.

The project director noted that on other occasions Title VII had told them to lower their funding requests without even looking at the program to see what components should be cut. He suspects that the Title VII program office doesn't use their evaluation, particularly since they never visit the project. He says they may have visited the project once but that is all.

There is more real interaction with the state bilingual people; from this source comes information about what is happening at the state level and what other projects in the state are doing. The state also helps line up consultants and materials and is presently considering legislation that would provide money for bilingual education. At this point the state funds only one person, the state bilingual consultant.

One superintendent complained that the main problem is that Title VII funding is typically granted long past April 15, which, according to state law, is the deadline for sending termination papers to staff members. Only the very large school districts in the state have enough flexibility to take the risk of holding on to staff members in anticipation of uncertain funding.

Another superintendent reiterated his distaste for the federal bureaucracy, including Title VII. He says there are too many levels to contend with and too much red tape. The federal staff is too far removed from kids. He noted that he had just received a rejection notice for continuation funding for a sort of halfway house for Indians. The proposal was rejected because it was two days late. He has turned the matter over to the Indtoo Tribal Council, because they have a certain degree of political influence.

SYLMAR SCHOOL DISTRICT

Site time at Sylmar was one day. There were four primary informants:

Co-instructor (aide): A fiftyish Indwan woman who has been on the project for two years. She was previously the school cook (place-bound).

Co-instructor: An Indwan in her mid-twenties who has been with the project for all four years (career-bound).

Teacher: An Anglo in her early fifties or late forties. She has been with the district sixteen years (place-bound).

Superintendent: An Anglo in her forties who had no prior administrative experience. She applied as teacher but was hired as superintendent (place-bound).

The Sylmar school district is actually one school, grades K-8. No one of Spanish origin attends the school. School personnel estimate the Indwan population of the school at about 65 percent. There are 40 to 50 students in the school. The district buses its 30 or so high school students 10 miles away to Tarlton.

Most parents of Indwan students work in a nearby mine and commute to the reservation on weekends. Anglos are from long-established ranch families. Some Anglo kids feel discriminated against because each year the Indians receive a new set of clothes through the tribal council and are fairly well dressed, whereas few of the Anglo kids are.

The superintendent at Sylmar school is also the principal and teaches English and mathematics in the 7th and 8th grades. There are two other regular teachers, and three paraprofessionals, whom they call co-instructors. All three co-instructors are Indwan Indian. To round out the staff, there is a cook, a custodian, and a secretary. There is one other person whose title is Itinerant Teacher. His salary is paid partly by BOCES, the multi-district organization which administers Project ROS. He is assigned to Sylmar school because there is a Title VII project there, but he doesn't teach the bilingual classes. He moves around as needed, at all levels from K-8.

The students are in four groups: kindergarten (with only three kids); grades 1-3; grades 4-6; and grades 7 and 8. Except for kindergarten there are one teacher and one aide for each group. Kindergarten is a shared responsibility for all staff.

Current Project Characteristics

The Indwan component of the program consists of 30 minutes of arts and crafts instruction and 30 minutes of Indwan language instruction per day. All students participate. Kindergartners get 45 minutes of arts and crafts. Seventh and eighth graders get no language instruction because the Indian students (most of whom know the language) protested that they found it boring.

During regular instruction the co-instructor acts as a teaching aide. The teacher provides the main instruction and the co-instructor provides special help to Indwan children who don't understand what is going on; the teacher provides the same sort of intensive teaching to Anglo kids.

The superintendent has full responsibility for the bilingual project in her district. If there are problems, she handles them, but the teachers can appeal to the project director if they choose; then they work it out. The superintendent feels that the project director is very cooperative in these situations. Her involvement is generally strictly administrative, however. The project director sets up monthly objectives that must be met, and otherwise the aides run the program--at least the content of the program. The superintendent says that there are many traditional aspects the Anglos don't know about or don't understand and for that reason she keeps out of it as much as possible.

The co-instructor is proud of the Indwan component in the program and thinks Indwan parents are grateful that the school is doing something to maintain traditions, culture, and language--about which the parents are not always knowledgeable enough to pass on. She views Indwan bilingual education primarily in terms of culture preservation as compared with a transitional concept which would enhance Indwan students' ability to compete on basic skills with Anglos.

Initiation/Implementation

According to one teacher, a need was noted for Indwan instruction in Sylmar prior to the inception of the program, but nothing was done until an earlier hispanic superintendent started oral English classes for Indwans five years ago. Four years ago, with the help of BOCES, the superintendent instituted a bilingual education program in Sylmar.

According to the present superintendent, Project ROS started up in a hurry. There was no needs assessment. BOCES became aware that the Title VII funds were available, and they took advantage of this situation and applied.

Instruction. In the first year (1970-71), a bilingual program was offered for kindergartners, which reenforced Indwan language (conversation only).

In the second year the program was extended to kindergarten and 1st grade.

In the third year of the program, 1972-73, the district was responsible for kindergarten, and Title VII for 1st and 2nd grade. In the fourth year, language classes were extended to all grade levels.

When she first arrived at the school at the start of the fourth year, the superintendent had the feeling that the program was running the school rather than the other way around. One problem centered around a new teacher who had arrived in the fall with high hopes and was led to a quick disillusionment. Apparently, her aide became a scapegoat. The aide in turn felt hindered by the teacher's interference. So the superintendent reorganized the program so that, at least in her words, both the teacher and the aide could achieve their own objectives. She reduced the bilingual component to 30 minutes from the original 45 minutes. Another change was dropping the Indwan language from the 7th and 8th grade components. The 7th and 8th graders now receive mostly arts and crafts during that period. The aides are unhappy with the shorter time period of the component. They feel that in arts and crafts especially there is no time to get into the crafts because it takes a certain amount of time to get out material, etc.

Materials. The school has developed many of its Indwan instruction materials, including a word and picture game called "Concentration" which involves matching pictures with Indwan and English words that hang on classroom walls.

The teacher informant stated in-service workshops sponsored by BOCES have been a great help in creating Indian language and teaching materials. Sylmar developed a coloring book in Indwan and English which BOCES published, then translated into Spanish for distribution to other districts. In the last few years more formal commercial materials for Indwan instruction have become available and are being used.

Intra-Staff Relations. The teacher, who is probably the project's staunchest Anglo supporter, admitted that she herself has difficulty accepting Indwan interpretations of things such as the creation of the world as related by an Indwan aide. She feels there is something un-Christian about Indwan culture which conflicts with her Christian beliefs. She found it strange that many Indwans allow Christian and Indwan beliefs to co-exist within their minds, and expressed disapproval over the fact that not all of her students celebrate Christmas.

She feels the contributions of Title VII in the district have been toward greater understanding of Indwan-Anglo cultural differences. But this contribution has sometimes led to teaching difficulties. For example, after understanding the huge family difficulties faced by Indians, she may feel so sympathetic that she expects less of these students. She has "almost given up teaching measurement concepts" after her co-instructor explained that Indwans have different concepts of distance, which make it difficult to understand things such as feet and inches, but which "allows them to relate better to infinity." She feels this greater awareness of cultural differences will be a lasting effect of Title VII. She could cite no other specific examples of lasting effects.

The aides all seem to be self-assertive, rugged individualists, and they seem to be running the program pretty much the way they want to; but they are becoming discouraged. There were many changes in district personnel in 1973-74. They have a new superintendent, new teachers, and there has been a revolt on the school board. The new board is now much less favorably disposed to the program. The new superintendent is also less supportive than the previous one. Consequently, the aides are less conscientious about setting objectives and following them through.

Community Relations. In February 1974 there was a recall election in the district, instigated by a man named Schultz, who claimed the school board did not represent the community's views that Indians should learn English first, not Indwan culture and language. Two board members were recalled and Schultz and one other person were elected in their places. Schultz is very vocal in his opposition to bilingual education. According to one teacher, the morale of the school has declined as a result.

There are five school board members, all Anglo. One aide stated that Indwans haven't wanted to run for this office.

The superintendent noted that the community knows about the program but is not really involved in it. The Indians don't come to Advisory Council meetings. This is probably because the meetings tend to be scheduled on Thursday or Friday, and the Indian population lives in the community during the week and heads south to the reservation on weekends. (The aide claimed that the Council had not met since the previous school year.) The superintendent feels the situation is probably better in Sylmar than in other school districts, and she believes this might be because the aides at Sylmar are Indwan.

She says the parents all come around off and on, often to sell jewelry and artifacts to school personnel. There are no formal parent-teacher conferences. The Indians seem to be very enthusiastic about the program, but the Anglos are not. Some Indwan parents have objected to Indwan language instruction, fearing this will detract from their children's ability to learn English and to compete in an English-speaking world. She feels that she has appeased the dissenters with her new scheduling arrangement. Now the parents know there is a regular classroom time for the Indwan component, and the parents have confidence that the main emphasis of the school is still on the 3Rs. Before, some Anglos felt there was too much time spent on the bilingual component.

Future Prospects

The superintendent admitted that teachers are somewhat dissatified with the program. She herself would prefer a more transition-oriented model. She believes she has somewhat ameliorated the situation with the teachers as well as the community. She would like to carry on the bilingual program after the federal funding is discontinued, but she doesn't know how the district could afford it. Apparently the costs, especially of crafts materials, are high. The teacher thinks BOCES absorbs too much of their Title VII allotment: "BOCES gets all the administrative funds."

Financial pressures have caused three grade levels to be combined this year. The teacher informant dislikes this. In addition, a state law will force Sylmar to accommodate twenty or so high school students next year, causing further financial strains. Adding this to the weakening support of school board and teachers, and the growing discouragement of the aides, it seems very unlikely that there will be a bilingual program at Sylmar after next year when Title VII funding is terminated.

We felt that perhaps the aides have been too independent and self-sufficient in their conduct of the program and that perhaps their focus, emphasizing maintenance of culture/language and providing an Indwan presence in the school as sort of a morale factor for the Indwan kids, has been too narrow.

By isolating the program away from the participation of the teaching staff and the Anglo community, they may have themselves unintentionally eroded the support they needed from teachers and the community. This is unfortunate because the teaching staff is more representative than the aides of the district's power structure, and therefore it was important for the aides to work effectively with them.

The situation seems to be almost the reverse of the more universal problem where an educational intervention may falter if a district staff tries to implement a project without seeking the involvement of the target constituency.

WEST BLUFF SCHOOL DISTRICT

Fieldwork at the West Bluff School District took about two person-days. The primary informants were:

The superintendent, who has been in his present job since before Project ROS began (place-bound).

The principal, whose present role also predated Project ROS (place-bound).

The co-instructor (place-bound).

The district counselor, who has been counselor in the district for 11 years. He counsels all grade levels, but much of his time is spent in his special intermediary role with discipline of Indtoo high school students (place-bound).

The LEA

Three thousand students attend West Bluff public schools, and of these 500 are Indian and 250 are Spanish-surnamed. The school board is entirely Anglo. Twelve tribes are represented in the student body. Three hundred are Indtoo, and the second largest group is Indwan. The proportion of Indians in West Bluff schools has increased over the last four years. This is because Indians are coming up from the reservation and from out of state.

Indwan students don't have the same problems Indtoos do in school. The counselor says Indwans work harder; they come from a background of farmers and planters, not hunters like the Indtoos. They see more value in schools, and they move to the city so the kids can attend schools. Only one Indtoo family, on the other hand, lives off the reservation. But the reservation is very near West Bluff, and the Indtoo children are bused into school. All Indtoos receive a stipend from their tribe, plus a flat sum of approximately $8,000 when they turn 18. If Indtoo families move off the reservation, they receive neither their monthly stipend nor the free housing and health care.

Title VII is not the district's only external source of bilingual education funding. It has been receiving Johnson-O'Malley funds out of the Bureau of Indian Affairs since the 1930s. At present these funds are used largely to fund a Head-Start-like all-day program for Indian children. But now that the district is implementing a regular Head Start program these Johnson-O'Malley funds will be partially redirected for more teachers' aides for the 1st grade. Part of the Johnson-O'Malley funds will be retained to supplement the Head Start program for the Indians so that they can have an all-day program rather than the typical half-day Head Start program.

Current Project Characteristics

Nettle is the elementary school (grades K-6) that has the Indtoo bilingual component of Project ROS. There are about 300 students: 261 Anglos, 28 Indtoos, 35 Spanish-surnamed, and 2 other (Japanese). There are fourteen teachers and eight aides. The school has been a pilot school in West Bluff for other programs (i.e., continuous progress, activities of student's choice twice weekly, special classes, visual perception screening) which later spread to the district.

The Indtoo Tribal Council has insisted that only Indtoos receive Indtoo language instruction. Indtoo class is held in a trailer especially purchased for an Indian cultural arts program with Johnson-O'Malley funds. Each class consists of only three or four kids.

Indtoos in grades K-3 receive approximately 20 minutes of Indtoo instruction per day, four days a week. This consists of drilling Indtoo words and vocabulary, and English translation. On Fridays, the lesson consists of crafts, discussions of Indtoo festivals, etc. Kindergarten and 1st graders do not discuss history other than that related to festivals. Each co-instructor spends half her day conducting the 20-minute Indtoo lessons; the remainder is spent working as an aide to the teachers in whose classes she teaches Indtoo.

Initiation/Implementation

According to the principal, no special need was perceived before BOCES informed Nettle School of the opportunity to have bilingual education. Initially, some parents (Anglos) wondered whether the bilingual program should be a priority, but the principal recalls no organized community opposition to the program. She stated the school saw an opportunity to be innovative by trying the bilingual program and that she and the staff were enthusiastic.

The bilingual education program began at Nettle in 1970-71, with a kindergarten class being served. Kindergarten and 1st grades were served in the second year, and in the third year K-3 participated. According to the principal, the bilingual program has changed very little from the first year, other than having been expanded and having more evaluation done by BOCES with the help of teachers.

Materials. The co-instructors developed their own materials. All Indtoo written materials must be approved by the Tribal Council, which fears encroachment by the white man on the so-far unwritten Indtoo language.

Staff. The superintendent verbalizes the desire to obtain a richer ethnic mix among his staff. He says he has no problem obtaining Spanish-speaking teachers.

He has two teachers who are Indian, but they are neither Indwan nor Indtoo. Indtoo teachers are out of the question, since to his knowledge there are no certified Indtoos, for that matter few have ever graduated from college.

Community Relations. The Indtoo program in West Bluff has been very political. There has been little parental involvement, and most Indtoo involvement comes from the Tribal Council, none of whom apparently have students in the project. The superintendent did note, however, that in the past year or two parents have become involved in the project, visiting classrooms and occasionally volunteering for aid in the classroom. The counselor attributes parent involvement to the fact that the project director has moved parent meetings from West Bluff to the tribal headquarters.

The counselor noted that it took a long time to gain the confidence of the Indtoos when he began working with them. They are shy and do not appreciate strangers on the reservation. Only eight out of the thirty or so Indtoo parents that the counselor heard from wanted Indtoo to be taught in schools. As one father stated, "It's the school's job to teach my child the white man's way; if I want him to learn Indtoo I'll teach him."

The main point of contact with the Indtoo tribe is the Indtoo Board of Education, an openly elected group that serves in an advisory capacity to the West Bluff board of education. The tribe has given the Indtoo board authority for dealing with education matters, but it is the Indtoo tribal council, also popularly elected, that makes the big decisions.

At one point during the fieldwork, the school psychologist volunteered his dissatisfaction with the bilingual program. He feels kids suffer from learning two languages as early as kindergarten, when they have not completed language development in one language. He also stated kids in the West Bluff school district can generally speak English by the time they come to school and that the Indtoo students come primarily from young families who do not speak Indtoo in the home. The psychologist feels that it's important to build up a kid's self-concept and to make him feel good about himself. Then he will learn; a second language is not in itself as important.

The principal stated that the school's philosophy of building a student's self-image was enhanced by the bilingual program. She feels a modified program will be offered by the district next year.

The superintendent believes there are good prospects for continuance of Project ROS when Title VII funding terminates after next year. He says that the intensity of the program will change drastically, as well as the objectives, when the district assumes funding. For example, language instruction will become secondary to cultural emphases. He feels that given the relationship between the district and the tribe, the language component is not within the school's jurisdiction. In his words, the Indtoos have been telling him that "you teach the kids the white man's way and we will teach the kids the Indtoo way."

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Initiation/Implementation/Impacts

Most externally funded education projects in several contiguous counties are sought and administered through BOCES. This is the case with Project ROS, which begins its fifth year of Title VII funding in 1974-75. Bilingual education has little precedent in the region. BOCES ran a "multi-culture service center" in the late sixties, and West Bluff (one of BOCES' constituent districts) has received Johnson-O'Malley funds through the Bureau of Indian Affairs since the thirties.

There was no formal needs assessment leading to the request for Title VII funds. The BOCES committee of school superintendents directed the BOCES director to apply, although not all superintendents thought it was a good idea. The original proposal was designed by a committee of two laymen (representing Indwans and Indtoos), two superintendents, the BOCES evaluation staff, and a consulting firm that did the actual writing.

Project ROS was implemented in one school in each district. Indwan is the non-English target language in some districts, and other districts target Indtoo. The project was to begin with kindergarten and 1st grade, add 2nd grade the second year, then 3rd grade in the third year.

As the years went by, the districts have modified the general model to better meet their respective needs, so that at the end of the fourth year there is considerable interdistrict variation. In three districts, the project now serves all grade levels in the project school. Use of the project staff varies also. In some districts, the project is administered by a project teacher, with or without assistance of noncertified co-instructors; in other districts, co-instructors run the show, and project teachers divide their time between regular instruction and Project ROS. Because of the intervention of the federal Title VII office, one district is not allowed a project teacher.

There are some similarities in project implementation among the various districts. All regular teachers are monolingual-English. Project teachers are Anglo, but have some knowledge of the Indian languages. Co-instructors match their respective target students in ethnicity. In the two sites visited by Rand staff (Sylmar and West Bluff), regular classrooms were not bilingual. Project students spend 20 to 40 minutes per day in bilingual instruction, either in their homeroom or in pull-out groups. During parts of the day when co-instructors are not presenting bilingual classes, they are in the regular classrooms to assist kids who have difficulty with English. Indwan classes are integrated; Indtoo classes are not.

Most materials used for the project have been locally developed, primarily as part of the project in-service training. Project staff are required to attend Saturday training sessions. Regular staff attend on a voluntary basis, and participation by the Sylmar staff is fairly regular. Teachers receive some remuneration and college credit.

From the beginning, there has been community resistance to the project, although now the project director characterizes it as reluctant acceptance. He believes the resistance has roots in prejudice and misunderstanding of bilingual education, at least on the Anglo side. The Indian target populations are docile, and have viewed the project with some suspicion. The community reticence probably has more to do with community attitudes than with the particular way the project is administered; the project director made a point of saying that he avoids personal involvement in community politics. There is also disagreement among members of the various district staffs as to whether it is educationally sound to teach young students two languages at once.

Other project-wide barriers during the four years include the fact that the second project director was Anglo. Also, some project teachers complained about the fact that the project is administered out of BOCES rather than the individual districts; and that this arrangement induces an absentee leadership group that absorbs a large share of the funds.

There were also complaints about intrusive directives and budget disallowances from the federal Title VII offices. More useful interaction is allegedly possible with the state bilingual education officer. Failure of the federal funding cycle to mesh with district recruitment schedules also causes distress.

The one fairly unanimous positive impact of Project ROS has been changes in schools resulting in the improvement of self-image among target students, and some growing sympathetic awareness among Anglos.

Sylmar. Sylmar is a community sharply divided between the old-line Anglo rancher/farmers and the newly arrived Indians who have come to work the mines. Though in the minority, the Anglos control the school, and probably pay the major share of school taxes. Project ROS enjoyed a supportive environment during the first three years, but last year the composition of the school board changed abruptly, and the project has been under fire ever since.

The project is run by three Indwan co-instructors, who provide Indwan language and culture (arts, crafts, and legend) instruction to all 30 or 40 kids in grades K-8. The co-instructors had fairly loose rein with the project until this year's new superintendent observed that the project seemed to be running the school; she reduced the time devoted to the project, much to the dislike of the co-instructors.

In 1973-74, Sylmar had a new superintendent, a new teacher, and two new school board members, none of whom are entirely happy with Project ROS. One school board member is particularly antagonistic. As a result, school morale has declined, the co-instructors are discouraged, and the project seems to be faltering. Co-instructors are beginning to ignore project objectives.

West Bluff. West Bluff is the largest community in the region, and the only district with more than one elementary school. Project ROS provides an Indtoo bilingual program for grades K-3 in Nettle School, serving only Indtoo kids. Project ROS is developing a written form for the Indtoo language, a project for which the Indtoo people are not wholly sympathetic. The Indtoo Tribal Council, which is apprehensive about losing tribal secrets, has been very slow to cooperate.

Dissemination/Continuation

There is little evidence of dissemination in the project sites that were visited, except that at Sylmar the project has expanded to more grades than promised in the project proposal. Even so, this expansion seems to have been accomplished by reallocation of project personnel and resources, rather than by increased resource commitment on the part of the districts. At West Bluff there is room for extension of project activities into the regular classrooms, but this apparently has not taken place. At Sylmar, the project seems to have already saturated the school, and is now contracting.

Prospects for continuance of the program in its present form are not very bright, at least in these two sites. The project will probably continue in West Bluff, but with no Indtoo component. The future at Sylmar seems especially dim, given that district's severe fiscal bind, the school board's antagonism, the superintendent's preference for a transition-oriented program, and the failure of the co-instructors to deal with these impediments.

The administrative organization of Project ROS may have made it especially difficult to deal with the attitudes and resistance patterns that it faces. Centralized administration via BOCES is probably a very efficient approach for educational interventions in this rural region. But given both the predispositions against bilingual education on the part of the community and staff, and the different characteristics of the various project sites, the project probably should have stronger on-site leadership. The co-instructors who are in charge at some sites are very well qualified in their subject matter, but their nonprofessional backgrounds have put them at a disadvantage in obtaining active support of the district staffs.

Annex

COMMENTS ON THE PROGRAM

THE PROJECT DIRECTOR AND FORMER DIRECTOR ON IMPROVING BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mary White, former project director, and Juan Domingo, project director, editorialized at length on ways to improve bilingual education. Some of their comments are reported below.

In the area of teacher training, Mary thinks it would be beneficial to focus on the vocabulary that is necessary to teach concepts in the classroom; apparently it is this vocabulary that a typical bilingual person generally does not have. Mary thinks that teachers need to be better informed as to the role of a consultant, and she believes that consultants also need to know their role. In her experience, consultants have been very well prepared intellectually but not very aware or competent in a practical sense. When it gets down to specific cases, often the consultants don't really know what to do and try to snow the teachers to save face. Each consultant who comes along claims to have the perfect way to accomplish some objective, but the prescriptions of different consultants are seldom the same; thus the teacher finds herself changing her procedures each time a different consultant comes along.

A project such as Project ROS needs an on-site supervisor, or at least an on-site locus of decisionmaking responsibility. Mary says that when teachers need help the need is immediate, and if they can't get immediate help they tend to give up. The absentee directorship by virtue of having a project funded through BOCES has resulted in this kind of problem. The directorship is spread too thin.

Another need is to help minority adults get over their inferior feeling and make them realize their potential strengths, especially with respect to participation in classroom instruction. Mary believes that in many respects this is a very good resource that is going to waste; on the other hand she believes that the problem of bringing these adults around so that they realize this strength is really much more of a task than the project teacher can accomplish on her own.

Juan Domingo would like to see two advisory committees instead of the one that is specified in the Title VII guidelines. There would be an Anglo parent advisory committee and a minority parent advisory committee. He believes that by having a separate committee, the minorities parents would be more likely to voice their concerns. After separate meetings the two committees could meet for their joint recommendations.

Domingo feels that the national materials dissemination center is of little help and that it is necessary for Project ROS to develop all its own materials. He would like to see regional dissemination centers formed in order to get more relevant material.

Finally, Mary suggested that five years, which is the typical funding cycle for Title VII, is not long enough to see tangible results. For example, in the affective area one of the expected tangible results is a decrease in dropout rates. If a program treats students in their K through 5th grades and if dropout tends to be a problem that occurs in high school, then it is not too likely that a change in the dropout rate that could be attributed to the project will be seen within the project's lifetime.

BEN TECUMSEH ON INDIAN CULTURE

Ben Tecumseh was the Indwan representative on the committee that prepared the original Title VII proposal. He has lived near West Bluff since 1967. In an interview, he commented on aspects of Indian culture that he feels should be considered in a bilingual/bicultural program.

He emphasized that one problem with a government-funded bicultural project like Project ROS is that you are not allowed to allude to the religious aspects of the culture. The problem with this is that for Indians, religion is essentially equivalent to culture. All clothing, colors, etc., have religious aspects. To treat culture aside from religion is a little mendacious, at least from the Indian standpoint. He feels that if the religious aspect were acknowledged, Indians might be a little less distrustful and there might be more in the way of parent involvement.

He said that Indians don't departmentalize like whites; the secular and religious aspects of their life are all the same. He spoke of the Indian's respect for life and the cycles of nature and on the white man's seeming intent of using things up as quickly as possible. He discussed the whites' newly found ecology movement and noted that these concerns have always been dominant in the Indian religion. He characterized the Indian as having a circle society, not the square society of the white with the hidden corners. That is to say, the white man might say one thing but mean something else, the meaning of the statements being hidden in the corners somewhere. The Indian, on the other hand, is up-front, and his statements can be accepted at face value.

He complained that white ministers do not understand that God can talk to the Indian himself without the aid of an intermediary. He says that religion for the

Indian is more personal, and one of the chief results of the exposure of the Indian to the white church has been the development of guilt feelings on the part of the Indian toward the Indian ways. He feels that Project ROS played an important role in his personal awareness of the noncontradictoriness of the Indian and white (Christian) cultures. He now finds no conflict between the Bible and the religious aspects of his Indian upbringing.

He encourages both sides for his kids, and he thinks that they are healthier for it. He believes that the older kids who did not have the advantage of Project ROS still have many more identity problems. They can't decide whether to be Indians or whites. He believes there is a strong need for a similar bicultural program in the junior high school in order to decrease the high school dropout rate. In other words, maintenance of high self-concept needs should be carried through adolescence to the point where the kids have recognized that the objectives of public education are not inconsistent with their own backgrounds and long-term needs.

He did allow that there are limits to the extent to which a bicultural program ought to bend to conform to traditional ways, especially in areas which may cause difficulty for the Indian to succeed in the white culture in later years. His prime example had to do with Indian time. Indians traditionally split the day into two parts, morning and afternoon. They resist fussing over the hourly (and fractions thereof) notions imported by the white man. If a meeting is scheduled for 8 a.m., a man on Indian time might just show up at 10 a.m. Ben has little patience with this behavior, because he knows how it can handicap "success."

Finally, he told why he thinks the Indwans are relatively more industrious than the Indtoos. He said that the Indwans at one time were displaced from their native lands by the whites, but that when they were finally provided with their own reservation, they were returned to those lands that were most sacred to the tribe. He said that the Indtoos were traditionally hunters and fisherman, but the government has tried to make them farmers and has permanently displaced them from their sacred lands. He believes that this has led to the Indtoos' relatively slow socio-economic progress compared with the Indwans. He said that the Indtoo family structure and social structure have become weak and that this is reflected at the tribal level in the fact that funds the Indtoo tribes receive from the government are prorated on a monthly basis to everyone who remains on the reservation. The Indwans, on the other hand, do not give stipends to tribal members but use those funds for economic development, for certain kinds of loans, for investments, for education scholarships, and for other purposes designed to enhance the tribe's collective strength.

WEST BAY

Gerald C. Sumner and Marta Samulon

We interviewed four primary informants during our brief visit to West Bay:

The assistant superintendent, who has been in the district since 1956 (place-bound).

The project director (place-bound).

The director of special projects (career-bound).

Two community activists, one of whom has been a longtime antagonist of the district. The other was a member of the ill-fated original bilingual steering committee (place-bound).

THE LEA

West Bay is a town of 32,000 persons in a coastal western state. The area has long been agricultural, and until the second World War was on the migrant stream. But now the area is less transient, and a large number of housing developments are in place or under construction. Approximately one-third of the population has Spanish surnames, and this group is predominantly Mexican-American. According to school district information, a high proportion of the Spanish-surname population have incomes below the poverty index, and circumstances prevent them from breaking out of the poverty cycle unassisted.

Seventy-eight hundred students attend the district's six elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. The district gets about 20 or 30 immigrant enrollees (from outside the United States) each year. An estimated 5 percent of the student population is not primarily English-speaking, and almost all of those in the primary and middle grades are currently in bilingual classrooms.

The district's annual expenditure per pupil is $1050, with a little over one-third coming from state and federal sources. Teachers' salaries start at $8600 and average $13,000.

One of the big problems in the district is facilities. The last bond issue was passed in 1968 to build a new school, which still hasn't been built. Kids who would attend that school are attending Columbus Middle School, which more or less is a collection of boxy temporary buildings with no windows. Lately there has been a controversy over the quality and kind of services being provided minority citizens; not only Chicanos, but also blacks and Anglos are among the district's antagonists. They don't respect the district's credibility; they don't believe the district staff will honor its promises and commitments, and there are apparently several groups who would like to unseat the board of education. The district has revised its affirmative action program this year. It has identified target groups, and has established goals and strategies for achieving better racial balance.

The district is now in its sixth year of integration, which includes a very controversial busing program. The project director claimed that the school district is totally integrated according to any criterion, thanks to busing, and that the busing will continue in the future.

The assistant superintendent noted that funding has been important all along the line in developing the integration effort. However, the district is now at the put-up or shut-up stage and the psychological demonstration period is over, especially for the Chicanos. The district can no longer get by serving one school with special programs and not another. It must serve all kids and not just certain specified target groups; for this reason the categorical funding--that is, the projects typically funded by categorical funding--is less appropriate. The district may soon find itself obliged to support more such programs from its regular budget in order to serve the school population as a whole.

PROJECT INITIATION

In the early 1950s there was considerable bias in West Bay schools against the Spanish language. For example, kids were punished for speaking Spanish on school grounds. This policy turned 180 degrees in the late 1950s, and the assistant superintendent claims that since then the Spanish language has come to have a special position in the district. There has always been a "large scale" adult program in the district. In the early 1960s a YWCA bilingual team was brought in to work in the district with both kids and adults. But the first complete program that involved actual bilingual instruction began with the 1965 preschool program. Also around this time, some schools incorporated tracking in order to achieve bilingual education.

In the late 1960s the school district was agonizing over whether and how to integrate its Anglo, black, and Chicano school populations. The commitment to integration has affected the structure of the bilingual program. That is, it became very important to construct a program that served several schools instead of a few, and that served both Anglo and Chicano kids. Title I had for years focused on language development and English as a Second Language (ESL), but at this time there was a general growing dissatisfaction with ESL.

In the fall of 1970 the district was beginning to implement a pilot bilingual project as part of its overall integration plan. This pilot project, proposed by a study group formed the previous fall composed of members of the district staff and interested persons in the community, was funded by Title I and involved one class at each of the first six grade levels. The committee made a recommendation in the spring of 1970, and the project was implemented the following fall.

Title VII was also funding a small program for curriculum techniques and research during 1970-71. This was a project headquartered in a neighboring state, but West Bay had the high school components. This project provided the school district with about $60,000 and gave it a chance to be exposed to the rigors of bilingual education. The project lasted only that school year 1970-71.

In the summer of 1970, the district set up a steering committee to plan an expanded Title VII project for the 1971-72 school year. The new director of program development was put in charge of the existing bilingual projects and was also asked to develop an application for the expanded project. At the same time certain community groups came forward with their own notion of a Title VII project--that is, a project that was totally Spanish and served only Mexican-American youngsters. A joint steering committee between the district and community groups was formed.

The steering committee never completely agreed on the format of the proposed bilingual project. The administration was committed to integration, so pressed for that particular model. Some Chicano leaders felt strongly that bilingual funds should be used for Mexican-Americans only. Some teachers felt the opposite way, resenting the fact that some kids might have the advantage of funding while others might not.

The committee finally compromised and offered to let Washington decide. They submitted four alternatives to the federal Title VII staff: (1) a pre-school model with heavy parent involvement; (2) a 50-50 integrated kindergarten-through-8th-grade model, based on a Title I bilingual project; (3) a so-called integrated early Spanish model, with instruction entirely in Spanish for kindergarten and 1st grade, with a transition toward English instruction in the 2nd grade; (4) a parallel curriculum model for high school which followed very closely the Title VII curriculum development project. The federal Title VII staff chose alternatives 2 and 4. The director of special projects thinks that the award was based on the fact that the district was integrated. He believes that at that time Title VII was under fire for funding so many segregated projects.

All members of the bilingual steering committee were involved in interviewing candidates for the project directors. The procedure became so political and emotion-charged that, in the director of special projects' opinion, a rational choice was probably impossible. They finally hired a young man who had some experience and was the most promising candidate, but who didn't work out as project director.

The foregoing account suggests that the project structure (grades K-12, integrated, transition oriented) was at least partly fortuitous. The assistant superintendent claimed that these project characteristics were goal-directed. He feels that the primary problem is social and economic degradation of Mexican-Americans, rather than language, but that bilingual education is useful for improving self-concept: "This alone justifies a quasi-maintenance position. For this reason the district offered a K-12 bilingual program rather than a more typical K-3 or K-4. On the other hand, education must provide the kids with freedom of choice, meaning the kids must be able to communicate, and have the discipline to learn, so the program aims at providing half the instruction in Spanish and half the instruction in English by the 3rd or 4th year."

ORIGINAL PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The Title VII Bilingual Program was initiated in the fall of 1971. The project served grades K-12 in integrated classrooms, both unusual characteristics for Title VII projects up to that time. The 750 kids in the program comprised about 15 percent of the school populations in the five schools where the program was located.

The stated goals were to (1) increase student achievement, (2) increase student motivation to learn, (3) increase understanding and appreciation of differences among people, (4) help students develop English fluency, (5) help students develop fluency in a language other than English.

At the K-6 levels, the program provided self-contained full-day classrooms with teachers and aides who conducted instruction in English or Spanish. The amount of English and Spanish each student had depended on his learning characteristics and his learning needs. As students became bilingual, their instructional day was to become approximately 50 percent English and 50 percent Spanish. The ability to deal with each kid's individual needs was primarily derived from a pull-out system whereby groups of kids with similar needs are taken from the classroom to a resource center, the library, or the playground to receive special ESL or remedial reading. To the degree that "facilities, class size, and staff personalities permit," there was teaming of teachers and aides in order to take advantage of special skills. Approximately 380 students in two schools participated in the K-6 level.

At the junior high level the bilingual program provided a two-period bilingual block of English and social science, as well as bilingual elective courses in music, math, journalism, and social science. Approximately 280 junior high students in two schools participated.

The high school provided bilingual courses in social science, physical education, and homemaking. Approximately 80 high school students in one school participated.

The principals were given free rein over project operation and curriculum, except for matters that would require a redirection of resources; instances of the latter sort required negotiation with the project director.

IMPLEMENTATION

Instruction

The project director claims that the project has now established an excellent bilingual curriculum for grades K through 4, most of it developed locally. The director of special projects noted that the success of the elementary bilingual programs has been primarily due to the excellent staff who were given extra resources and were told to do the best they could.

In the middle and high school grades the project is still fumbling. They are not sure they can develop bilingual skills in kids, let alone sustain these skills. The kids tend to resist bilingual education in upper grades. Apparently they are almost ashamed to take part; they don't want to identify with a "different" group. According to the assistant superintendent, the quasidepartmental situation of the middle and high school creates many problems in establishing the instructional model. In these upper grades bilingual classes are voluntary, and since bilingual education takes on a foreign language complexion, the kids are not too interested. Also, in the upper grades there aren't enough bilingual teachers who are also specialists in all other major curriculum areas to allow flexible scheduling. At one high school, for example, fewer than 10 percent of the students are in the bilingual program, which means that if a student wishes to take part in the bilingual program he has a hard time scheduling different kinds of classes.

The director of special projects noted that he originally felt strongly that bilingual-bicultural education ought to be preserved through grade 12 in order to keep the opportunity open to kids, thereby allowing cultural pluralism to be maintained. He is now growing skeptical of the ability of the organization to pull it off.

The district recently combined high school Spanish classes into a core of Spanish social sciences and fine arts, with the help of state funds. This may help overcome the problems that derive from the elective status of the bilingual project. By making the project seem more appropriate for college-bound, as well as noncollege-bound, students, the remedial stigma is diminished. The number of courses offered has increased greatly since the first year. Very few students in the upper grades are actually monolingual in Spanish; fewer than 2 percent in one year are immigrants. There is a severe need for bilingual education in the first six grade levels. After that, the needs to communicate "have been satisfied generally" and the purpose being served is of the affective variety. Students who enter the bilingual program as late as the 3rd or 4th grades have typically developed a strong resistance to the use of Spanish in integrated settings. The 1973 proposal for continuation funding addresses this challenge by claiming that the district is taking the unusual measure of developing a useful model for initial bilingual intervention at the 4th-6th grade level. This emphasis will alter when the kindergarteners and 1st-graders from the 1971 bilingual program move up to the intermediate level.

All interviewees independently volunteered the opinion that the upper grades are still fumbling around with their models. On the other hand, K-6 is still the same as in 1971, although there has been some improvement of the details on how best to get hold of curriculum and how best to allocate instructional time. They are still pressing toward the goal of 50 percent Spanish and 50 percent English instruction, and according to a 1973 GAO study, this was achieved. The district staff is also trying to see if there have been any measurable achievement gains, but it is proving hard to identify the baseline group.

Materials

According to the director of special projects, the project's curriculum development strategy has generally been to fumble around; in his estimation, this has worked. Teachers have become sophisticated in use of materials and have adjusted to the need for structure. He feels that they can now look back at their original ideals with less emotion.

Half the materials have been developed in the project itself. Materials from the Title VII curriculum centers are not particularly useful, apparently because many are developed abroad.

The director feels that a curriculum director is also needed badly. The original assumption was that curriculum leadership would come from principals, but this wasn't true, so in 1973-74, a curriculum director was appointed and money was provided for curriculum and service work by a team of teachers. Each school designated a representative to work on the team. However, participation is voluntary, and it has turned out that a representative from one of the elementary schools and one from the white middle school are the leaders on the team.

The state gave the district money to sharpen up its middle school program this school year. They were to establish a core program, but this has hit rocky times; it is not certain that they will be funded again next year. But this double funding situation--that is, Title VII and the state--has gotten in the way of curriculum development.

Curriculum development is also affected by the inherent differences between elementary and secondary schools. Secondary teachers focus on a specific subject, in a departmental structure, whereas elementary teachers focus on the self-contained, multi-subject classroom.

SSL (Spanish as a Second Language) is still one of the most difficult problems they are wrestling with--how to get the Anglo kids going. This problem is also part of the skepticism on the maintenance of the cultural pluralism idea.

Staffing

Project Director. Although the original project director was the most promising applicant, he apparently put himself into compromising situations too often in the continual struggle between community activists and district leadership. According to the director of special projects, he "didn't understand his dual role of key man in the organization and blood brother Chicano." The district dismissed the project director after one year. The district then asked the ill-fated steering committee to consider not having a project director for the following (1972-73) year and to use the $20,000 salary savings in the program. The committee agreed, and there was no project director during that year. The director of special projects was in charge of project coordination. Then at the close of the 1972-73 school year the new committee decided it wanted a director for 1973-74, because of the project's large scope and the district's shortage of facilities (which was precipitated by the failure to pass bond issues). For these reasons, the bilingual project really needed a special advocate. Accordingly, the second project director was chosen, but he was also given responsibility for compensatory education (Title I). Hence, after 1971-72, the project has never had one man who could concentrate on bilingual education alone. The director of special projects says that this is a general strategy of the district administration. It avoids isolation of programs, but on the other hand tends to dissipate innovative forces. He complained that innovative projects in general really need leadership to plan the pacing of development. He cited as an example the district's Title III Leap Forward project which had the luxury of a planning year. He feels Leap Forward really worked. Its first year was devoted to planning with teacher selection and training in the summer. The second year was for initial implementation, and the third year was for "consolidation." He feels that through this sort of pacing, the district now really has a fine math program.

Teachers. According to the project director, Title VII teachers have a harder task than the non-project teachers; for example, they have to attend the regular teaching staff meetings and the project meetings as well. Beyond that they have to meet with parents and prepare for holidays such as Cinco de Mayo and for other fiestas. The district does provide voluntary released time for teachers to work on curriculum; under this arrangement, some teachers have worked up to 50 days a year while others have put in no time on curriculum.

It has been hard to recruit qualified teachers for the project, largely because most teachers think in terms of ESL rather than bilingual education. The district apparently can't find bilingual-bicultural teachers who also have strong curriculum backgrounds. Bilingual-bicultural teachers invariably major in Spanish and social studies, giving short shrift to such areas as math and science. When the district can't find enough qualified bilingual-bicultural teachers to satisfy their needs, they hire Anglos. They have been more successful in obtaining bilingual-bicultural aides for all of the bilingual classes.

According to our community informant, the district has not been completely above board with respect to staffing. She claimed that teacher aides had not received the career advancement training spelled out in the original contract, so "they are still washing dishes" and babysitting. All of the aides are middle-aged housewives burdened by families. She feels the district should hire young aides who will have time to relate the program to the community, and of course to attend the meetings. Some teachers in the project are not Mexican-Americans, although according to her, qualified applicants are available. The district recruits from distant places and hires people who are unfamiliar with West Bay. She says she referred 10 or 15 students from a nearby college, but the district turned them down because they "were too involved"--that is, the students might be militant.

Relations with Regular Staff. There has been some staff jealousy between project and nonproject teachers, although this hasn't been at the level of teachers' organizations. The state teachers' association is the dominant one in the district; there are some American Federation of Teachers members at the high school. The state association has strongly supported the bilingual project even when there were problems dealing with some of its teachers.

BILINGUAL STEERING COMMITTEE

Apparently the community has always wanted to develop and control the bilingual programs of the district. These feelings ran especially high during the winter of 1971-72, and were probably one reason why local people were so bitter toward the school administration. Disagreement about the program and controversy over such issues as the dismissal of the project director militated to produce in-fighting within the steering group. A great deal of verbal abuse was heaped on the non-Chicano teaching staff at this time. Toward the end of the 1971-72 school year the steering committee destroyed itself; it couldn't agree on anything, even by-laws. Some district staff members and local people refused to participate. Finally, at the end of that school year both the director and the committee were relieved of their functions. The director of special projects feels that the steering committee's only useful result was to keep district management at arm's length from the program.

The second year's funding proposal promised to revive the steering committee but the focus was on long-range planning; supervision of operations would be left to school-level parent advisory groups. They never got the larger committee back together that second year. This was partly the result of a political strategy on the part of district administration. The school-level advisory groups were established and together they formed a sort of district advisory group.

In the fall of 1972, "self-perceived Chicano spokesmen" objected to the non-use of advisory groups for Title I and Title VII, so for two months the district and the "spokesmen" maintained an uneasy partnership with both sides trying to get parents out; but the parents stayed home and the so-called community leaders gave up their efforts and went back to criticizing the district.

According to the assistant superintendent, throughout the troubled times of the steering committee the community and district staff generally shared the same objectives but differed on strategy. There also had been many times when the strategies were the same, but semantics led to misunderstandings on both sides.

The director of special projects claims that the district has always had problems with the advisory groups for all the funded programs. They have tried cajoling, transportation help, etc., but they have never had a thriving advisory group at the district level, or at the school level, that really met the specifications in federal guidelines. The director feels that the problem of getting an advisory group for Title VII that functions as the guidelines specify is almost intractable. One school does have a working support group, but the focus there is on classroom assistance, as opposed to operational advice. The district just hasn't found the vehicle for getting blacks and Chicanos to participate. Encouraging community involvement could be a full time job, not the task of someone who has other responsibilities.

We attended a meeting of the 1973-74 Bilingual Advisory Committee, and the proceedings seemed rather tame. There was discussion of a district-wide bilingual presentation, affirmative action, and a field trip, with the project director and a Chicano politico doing most of the discussing. One of the attendees was a member of the formerly disbanded steering committee. She had nothing to say at the meeting, but was later critical in private discussion. She said that the committee members did not relate to the community and for that reason should not be regarded as community representatives. They didn't attend "community meetings." We asked several times about the identity or auspices of these meetings, but she was evasive. She objected that most committee members are monolingual Spanish and therefore could not be effective monitors of the district. She claimed that they were unaware of the details of the original proposal, which she feels should be a prerequisite for monitoring. She seemed to feel that the district has willfully neutralized Chicano participation through tokenism. The district allegedly had abetted the breakup of the original steering group because it was becoming powerful.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Initiation/Implementation/Impact of the Project on the LEA

The school district did not go into bilingual education cold. It had the benefit of considerable experience with ESL, as well as some limited bilingual curriculum research for the secondary grades. The district took advantage of Title VII funding to create a full bilingual program, determined that it would be a major instrument in its commitment to integrate the district. Simultaneously, various Chicano community groups began arguing for a Title VII program that would concentrate funding on Chicanos, that is, a segregated program. The two groups formed an uneasy partnership to write the original proposal, and they subsequently decided to leave the question of whether the program should be segregated up to USOE. The OE decided the project should be integrated, possibly because it had been under fire for funding so many segregated Title VII projects.

The project was first funded in 1971-72 as an integrated (representing OE's and the district's priorities) K-12 bilingual project (unusual not only because secondary schools were involved, but because it was initiated in all elementary grades simultaneously). In the elementary grades, the project was in rather typical self-contained classrooms, with pull-out groups for ESL and other intensive instruction. In the secondary grades, a small curriculum of required and elective courses with bilingual instruction was offered. In conjunction with the district's busing program, the bilingual project provided a viable vehicle for the district's integration effort. The project itself seems to focus on promoting the self-concept of Chicano youngsters; communication skills are important but secondary.

It would appear that the district sought instant institutionalization of the bilingual project into regular instruction. Curriculum leadership has always been delegated to principals or teacher committees, with weak results. Except for the first year, there has never been a full-time project director. And of course, they attempted to begin with a complete K-12 program, rather than working into it gradually.

Another unusual aspect at the beginning was that the original district/community group that worked on the proposal became the project's steering committee. This group not only took the place of the more conventional parent advisory council, but was given a significant decisionmaking role regarding project policy and operations. The district was therefore not responsible if the project should go awry. It is also unusual that the committee members from the community as well as from the district staff took this responsibility seriously. However, there was so much infighting between the two groups that the steering committee and the project director did not continue after the first year. Since then, the district has tried parent advisory groups at the school level, with an umbrella parent group at the district-wide level. Few nonparents are included, and the district seems to have taken pains to exclude Chicanos who were on the original steering committee. Advisory council participation is now relatively weak, and rarely provides policy input (or so we surmise).

At the end of the third year, all informants pointed proudly at the elementary school component of the project, but shook their heads at the secondary school component. Secondary grades are departmentalized, which allows little flexibility in individual participants' class schedules. Participants therefore stand out, which adolescents dislike. This has happened in West Bay and has weakened participation considerably. The district is trying to develop a larger bilingual core that will include regular Spanish classes so that a larger proportion of college-bound kids will be included in the bilingual curriculum. This experience points up the need for a model for initial bilingual intervention in secondary grades, although the current problems may vanish when kids who received initial bilingual instruction in early elementary school reach junior high.

Other stumbling blocks in the bilingual project have been SSL (SSL for Anglos has more of an enrichment flavor than ESL for Chicanos), recruitment of bilingual teachers who satisfy the district's preference for nonmilitancy, and coordination of activities funded by Title VII and the state.

Impact of the LEA on the Project

The aspect of the LEA that most strongly affected the project's character was the district's determination that the project would provide a major tool for instant desegregation, from kindergarten to grade 12. This rush to social change helps to explain why they entered into a project that was overambitious in scope and timing and rather weak with respect to operations and curriculum leadership.

Dissemination/Continuance

There is some feeling in the district that categorically funded interventions such as Title VII should be expanded from demonstration schools to the entire district, even at local expense. If this sentiment is pervasive among district staff, it bodes well for continuance and intradistrict dissemination. However, we saw little evidence of real dissemination within or outside the district; the project is preoccupied with its own implementation difficulties. Continuance of the existing project after federal funds are terminated is probably assured, at least for the elementary grades. Unless the community intervenes, the project will probably fade away at the secondary level. If the present busing program were to end, the project would necessarily become segregated.

Impact on the Innovation Process

The school district has undoubtedly become more wary of the community-group participation in the planning and administration of school programs, innovative or not. Presumably, it also has renewed respect for the virtues of project planning and pacing, and for providing innovative interventions with strong operations and curriculum leadership; programs such as the bilingual project, that make such heavy demands on facilities and staff, are in particular need of their own full-time advocate (i. e., project director).

METROPOLIS

Gerald C. Sumner and Marta Samulon

LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY

Metropolis is a large industrial city in the Southwest. Its school district serves a population of about 225,000 students in kindergarten through 12th grade. The number of kids who are "Spanish dominant" is 35,000; this number is arrived at through counts of Spanish surnames and subjective teacher assessments. The number of Spanish-dominant kids who have limited English-speaking ability, as determined by testing, is 8000. There are no accurate figures on the number of students who are monolingual in Spanish on entering schools, but it is reported that the total school population increases by 1500 each year, and most of the increase is due to Mexican émigrés.

According to the Title VII project director, the Spanish-speaking students are widely distributed throughout the six areas into which the school district is divided. Mexican-Americans and blacks are generally concentrated in the older parts of the city, including one area where ten Title VII schools are located. Dropout rates for Mexicanos range from 50 to 75 percent.

The Metropolis board of education is elected at large. Until two or three years ago, the board had a conservative bent, and was not especially sympathetic to innovation in education. At that time, the composition of the board began to be more liberal, and the climate for intervention followed suit. In the spring of 1974, the pendulum swung abruptly back to the conservative side, and at the end of the school year, the future prospects of many of the new programs were uncertain. There is one Mexican-American member of the school board, a lawyer who has been on the board for over two years. The board chairman is black.

Reportedly, Metropolis has rarely experienced the Chicano militancy that other Southwest areas have seen. Parents have been more outspoken in the last five years, but the protests are unorganized.

In 1972 there was court-ordered "pairing" of elementary schools for the purpose of desegregating Metropolis schools. Secondary schools were rezoned. The pairing was mandated by a district federal court judge and upheld by the court of appeals. Instead of splitting up kids within classrooms, the model was to pair black and white schools. Within the combined attendance areas, grades K-2 would go to one school, 3 and 4 to a second school, and 5 and 6 to a third school. The Mexican-

Americans had conveniently been declared legally white the previous year, so the judge paired Chicano schools with black schools. The Anglo schools in the district were not paired.

The pairing resulted in racial confrontations. Nine thousand Chicano kids were pulled out to attend strike schools, and it took a year to get them back into public schools. One of the long-term effects was to allow the Mexican community to feel its muscle and to organize. For instance, the committee set up to work with the strike schools has survived as a civil rights organization with the help of The Emergency School Assistance Act (ESAA).

The assistant superintendent reports that there is still tension between blacks and browns in Metropolis schools since the groups were forcibly mixed, and minorities are still underrepresented in the school district staff.

In addition to the pairing, there was a district-wide desegregation of staffing. At the time, the district had 35-percent black and 65-percent white in the schools. The court mandated that all school faculties share this ratio. This meant that two-thirds of the faculties in the black schools were uprooted and sent to white schools. One of the results has been an increase in Metropolis' white flight, accompanied by much lower test scores in the district.

The federal projects coordinator is one of several district administrators who thinks the pairing was a bad idea. She is not convinced that a child gains by being mixed with people who are just as culturally disadvantaged as he is. She feels income, as well as race, should be considered in mixing. She suspects that Metropolis' more affluent people do not want to share in the mixing of Metropolis' students.

At this time, the district has several programs oriented toward bilingual education: the classroom bilingual project, Title VII; staff development and dissemination and resource centers under ESAA; ESL* training teachers and curriculum development under Title III; and an ESL project funded by the district in 23 elementary schools. There is one teacher in each of these schools who is responsible for teaching new students ESL; the project also trains regular teachers to ease the load on project teachers. In addition, where possible, the district is providing monolingual English teachers with bilingual aides from the community, but is having trouble finding aides qualified academically for helping in the upper grades.

Beginning in the 1974-75 school year, an expanded bilingual education program is mandated by state law. The state plan is a transition program that requires districts with 20 or more non-English-speaking pupils to provide a bilingual program in the first three grades. The state will only provide $15 per child for materials.

---

*English as a Second Language.

The Metropolis school district has an interesting approach to program management. Although there is a federal program division, program development and proposal writing are the responsibility of the district's regular education division. The federal programs division worries about the mechanics of funding, getting proposals out, and managing the project during the term of federal funding. This is the district strategy for assuring that once the federal funding has stopped, the project will fit consistently into regular operations.

For example, the bilingual coordinator in the regular education division writes all bilingual proposals, with input from the intended directors who reside in the federal program division. The federal division guides the proposal administratively. After the government provides the money, the coordinator is still active in training, curriculum development, etc., but the federal program division is responsible for operation. This sort of matrix management is intended to give some unity to the district's special programs, particularly bilingual, mathematics, and English. The assistant superintendent points out that the coordinator coordinates rather than bosses the operation. He says the district has aggressively tried to eliminate the we/they between regular and special programs that is found in some districts.

During the last school year, the school board directed that a committee be formed to reorganize the school district. In April, the committee came up with a plan, and one of the recommendations is that a department for bilingual education with a department director and staff be established. It's not clear that it will be accepted by the school board since the board's composition had changed within the last few months of the school year.

CURRENT PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

At the end of its fifth year, the Metropolis bilingual project was serving just over 1600 students: 1250 in eight elementary schools, 250 in one junior high school, and 100 in one senior high school. Students represented kindergarten through 12th grade. There were 50 bilingual teachers, 25 aides, and 5 administrators.

Title VII funding during 1973-74 was almost $250,000, slightly over one-third of the total project cost. The remainder was picked up by state and local funding. Title VII money pays for 7 teachers, 12-1/2 aides, 5 administrators, materials, training, and other administrative costs.

Over 90 percent of the student participants are Spanish dominant. As one principal put it, "The priorities in the bilingual program are for those who need it the most." The Spanish-dominant kids typically come into the program with limited English vocabulary; there are over 100 monolingual Spanish kids each year. At least three separate Spanish dialects are used by students in the schools. Dialect differences have mainly to do with vocabulary and pronunciation; these differences apparently present problems only to the more inexperienced teachers.

All dialects are accepted in class, although teachers take pains to point out "the more correct way." One teacher noted that Mexican-American children born in the state have been intimidated about being Spanish dominant. This makes them shy in school and reduces their participation in class. She observed that children who come directly from Mexico don't have a problem with self-image since they were never made to feel inferior about speaking Spanish.

According to the present project director, there is some divisiveness exhibited among students in the bilingual program. This is in the form of rivalry between Mexican-Americans who speak English and Spanish monolinguals newly arrived from Mexico.

The project director also observed that the needs of the various schools vary, and the program varies accordingly. However, the impression resulting from the site visit was that variability can be better attributed to differences in individual teaching styles than to school differences. One teacher reported that the project administrators provide a suggested program of instruction, but she adjusts this to the needs of her class. For example, she normally does not teach a specific Spanish lesson, but teaches subjects in Spanish that students are having trouble comprehending in English. Another teacher plans a 30- to 40-minute lesson for each day. This teacher strongly disagrees with the notion that knowing Spanish first will help children from a Spanish-dominant background perform well in subjects taught in English; she believes that this approach discourages students from learning to think in English. One consistency that seems to run through all classrooms is that teachers avoid using both languages concurrently, except when absolutely necessary for comprehension.

Apparently, therefore, the instructional model seems to be loosely structured, with a few guidelines and objectives handed down by the project office. One teacher complained that district Title VII personnel seldom visit classrooms, but this complaint was not voiced by other teachers.

In the elementary schools, curriculum and teaching techniques parallel those of regular classrooms, except for the alternative use of two languages. Also, the elementary teacher has the half-time services of an aide, which allows more student grouping and some degree of individualized instruction. Classrooms are self-contained. There is also more emphasis on the traditional Mexican holidays.

In the secondary schools, which have departmental classroom organization, the bilingual project classes are elective. In the junior high, the offerings are bilingual ESL, bilingual RWS (reading/writing in Spanish), state history, and bilingual speech. In the senior high, the offerings are Mexican history, ESL, bilingual typing, bilingual algebra, and folkloric dancing.

During the last half of the 1973-74 school year, the project was under the administration of acting management. The original project director had been promoted to assistant area superintendent, leaving the project to his three chief administrators. The three were operating under the burden of a federally funded project that had about run its course, and the uncertainty as to their role the following year when the project is institutionalized in the regular education division.

INITIATION

There was no bilingual education in the district before Title VII. Most schools forbade Mexican or Hispano-American kids from speaking Spanish on school grounds until the early 1960s.

Before the Title VII project, Title I provided compensatory education to kids with language difficulties; five to seven years ago a teacher working with the principals of Spanish-speaking schools managed to set up an ESL program and brought in bilingual teachers. Also, the district had Spanish classes for Spanish speakers in four schools to enhance the child's attitude toward his native language. These classes were held before the regular school hours, but were discontinued later during an economic crisis. Bilingual education in Metropolis began in reality when the superintendent recruited a junior high principal, a Mexican-American, in the spring of 1968 to write a proposal for Title VII funding. Although he preferred being a principal, he gave up his job because as a "Mexicano" he felt a commitment to help his people. His position as project director meant he would have authority over principals in participating schools.

He became interested in bilingual education through his wife, who was head of foreign languages for the Metropolis school district. Six years before she had attended a conference at the Bilingual Institute of a local university and learned what was done to train bilingual teachers. She also instituted programs in Spanish for Spanish speakers and ESL in the district. Through her, her husband first heard about Title VII.

As a Mexican-American, the project director had been called on to attend community meetings and the board meetings that the district held regularly at various neighborhood schools. He recalls several parents who stood up at a high school meeting six years ago and asked why Mexican-American kids were unable to make higher scores on the scholastic aptitude test, why they couldn't pass tests such as for employment with the Southern Pacific Railroad, and why they were placed on vocational tracks at school. The project director named three or four of these parents to the bilingual advisory group that was formed later. They stand out in his mind because at the time they were very unusual in their outspokenness.

The project director did not use community persons or parents in the proposal writing, but did use resource people from the district, for example, language teachers and his wife.

The district received funding for the project to begin in the fall of 1969. The project director appointed three chief lieutenants: an elementary school teacher to work with K-2 (who succeeded the project director in the winter of 1973-74 when he was promoted to assistant area superintendent), a counselor in a junior high school (who is now the third project director) to work with secondary schools and act as community coordinator, and a Spanish teacher in elementary schools. Later, a second elementary teacher was brought in to assist with grades 3-6.

IMPLEMENTATION

The original project director summarized the following problems faced by the Title VII bilingual project in Metropolis:

1. Initial opposition to the concept of bilingual education by Mexican-American parents who feared their children's knowledge of English would be impaired.
2. Anglo parents who thought "Mexicans should learn English, not Spanish, so they can get a job and get off welfare."
3. Some initial opposition from school principals who feared change and sometimes disagreed with the Title VII project's philosophy.
4. Lack of curriculum materials.
5. Lack of support from universities that were not interested in training bilingual education teachers or developing curriculum materials.
6. The high mobility rate among initial participants in the Title VII bilingual project. This has made it difficult to evaluate progress and compare Title VII participants to nonparticipating students in the long run.

7. Federal guidelines that are too rigid and limited experimentation with curriculum and management techniques.
8. Not enough guidance from the Office of Education Title VII people. They were cooperative but understaffed.

After their five years of bilingual education, the present project director believes they are just now getting the swing of things. He feels that in some respects the period of five years is not really sufficient for evaluating bilingual education, largely because of the model recommended by Title VII, whereby the project begins at the 1st grade level and expands vertically, one grade level per year. The problem is that the development tasks are greater in the upper grade levels, and with this model the district experiences fewer years with those grades.

Instruction

During the first year of the project, there were six schools involved. Four were elementary schools, in which there was one 2nd grade classroom, five 1st grade classrooms, and six kindergarten classrooms on half-day schedules. There was also a junior high and a senior high.

Elementary. A grade level was added at each of the elementary schools in successive years. They were also able to individualize instruction somewhat with the help of learning centers within the classrooms. After the desegregation pairing, program continuity suffered in that many student participants sought private alternatives rather than attend designated schools located in strange neighborhoods. Project logistics also suffered in that the number of Title VII schools roughly doubled, although Title VII classrooms did not.

Secondary. In junior high, 7th graders were offered bilingual speech, bilingual RWS, and bilingual state history. In succeeding years, 8th and 9th graders were included, and the curriculum expanded to include ESL and Spanish for Spanish speakers.

In senior high school, the initial offerings were bilingual history of Mexico, Latin American history in Spanish, and ESL. Latin American history was dropped, and they added bilingual typing and Spanish for Spanish speakers.

The present project director claims that a selling job is required in the high schools. One of their strategies has been to work hard to get a few of the more popular kids into the project, and they seem to be magnets for other kids. He feels the problem with motivation with the high school kids may be alleviated when kids who began bilingual education in elementary school continue on to high school.

One senior high teacher considers the high school component of the bilingual project to be limited. He stated that most of his students are Mexican nationals and have been in the United States only a short time. These students have a problem finding classes they can pass in high school (due to their limited English knowledge). He reported that in the past, Mexican-American students were in the majority in his history class, but now the interest of Chicano students in Mexican history has lagged. He feels that these students may be more interested in contemporary problems of the Mexican-American and a Chicano studies course, but he himself is not interested in teaching this course as it is not his field of specialization. He notes that low student motivation should not be attributed to embarrassment among Chicanos about being different. "They are proud of their heritage."

Ethnic Mix. All but about 1 percent of the kids who remained in the attendance area have remained in the program, so apparently the program is not unpopular. On the other hand, there has been a high rate of attrition out of the respective attendance areas. Of the original 300 in the program, there are now only 50.

The original project director had organized the program with course offerings specifically for students with limited English knowledge from kindergarten through high school. The Title VII bilingual project served only Spanish monolingual children with first priority, then bilingual kids with Spanish dominance. It had ESL components. The cultural component of the program was to make the Mexican-American child proud of his culture and his historical roots in Mexico. The director thought this particular Title VII model was appropriate for the Metropolis clientele. He feels this "model" is not necessarily applicable to other Mexican-American communities, but it served Metropolis' special needs.

Title VII almost withheld funds in 1971, because of the lack of non-Chicanos in the program. The court-ordered pairing of 1972 also interfered with the initial idea of Mexican-only classes. The project director comments that he realized "we were becoming separatists by having this policy." When bilingual education began, it was available only in Mexican-American schools. The director decided to keep the programs in the "black-brown" paired schools. A decision was made to have blacks in class during Spanish instruction, in spite of the fact that at first they wouldn't understand much of the instruction. The black student was to be treated "like the Mexican student was in a class full of Anglos." The bilingual classrooms were mixed at the time of the pairing, but whenever someone dropped out of a bilingual classroom they were automatically replaced by another ethnic. By the spring of 1973, fewer than 10 percent of program participants were black or Anglo.

Staff

Recruitment. The Metropolis school district has a difficult time coping with the shortage of bilingual education teachers. The shortage is aggravated by the recent opening of higher paying professions for Chicanos. Metropolis competes with other southwestern states for bilingual teachers. In addition, there are other cities in the state that are able to pay Chicano teachers more than the Metropolis school district does (starting salary $7500). The recruitment problem may have an even more severe effect on voluntary federal programs such as Title VII: The school board is taking a hard look at all the bilingual education teachers being tied up in federal programs, especially now that it needs to institute a state-mandated bilingual education program.

Training. In-service workshops are provided by Title VII funding, but there is no comprehensive pre-service bilingual training. In the summer of 1973, Title III money provided an ESL staff development program for elementary teachers, plus stipends, and a similar program is planned for secondary teachers in 1974.

The bilingual coordinator complained that because colleges do not do a good job of teaching Spanish methodology, teachers must confront this problem in their own in-service programs. In the classroom, English, sooner or later, typically dominates in the regular instruction because even the Spanish-dominant teachers have been trained to teach some subject areas in English.

Intra-Staff Relations. Originally there was much antagonism toward Title VII: "Why teach Spanish? Why not English?" people asked. And others asked, "Why are there only a few hundred involved in the program?" Today, teachers, principals, and parents seem to want an expansion of the program. The bilingual coordinator claims a higher awareness, especially at building-level administration. For example, when she discusses bilingual programs with principals they ask about such things as curriculum process and program design. This is an improvement over their former attitude, that is, the simple, "We need something for the Mexican-Americans."

Originally, the principals seemed to be satisfied with improvements in discipline. On the other hand, resistance is not dead. One principal claimed that some principals are slightly prejudiced against the Spanish population in general and the bilingual project in particular. One teacher reported that there has been some resistance by older teachers to the bilingual project, that older teachers feel pressured by the new demands of bilingual instruction--having to go back to school, learning a new language, etc. -- and that they resent the activism of younger teachers.

The bilingual coordinator admitted that there is natural conflict between the federal program division and the regular education division, although this was not the case with the Title VII project. For example, federal project personnel may have travel allowances that district-funded regular education personnel do not. On the other hand, federal projects people sometimes have trouble gaining cooperation with building principals, a manifestation of the dual authority problem.

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

In the beginning of the project, some Mexican-American parents objected to their children learning Spanish in school. Parents now appear supportive, but a small proportion are still strongly opposed to the bilingual project because it is their belief that learning Spanish will hold their kids back. They also resent being classified as Spanish speaking. There has also been resistance to English as a second language, because of the feeling that non-native Americans should not have as much attention as native Americans.

The pairing of schools during the desegregation effort was especially damaging to the Title VII project; many families moved out rather than have their kids go to black schools. All teachers interviewed reported very little parental involvement in the classroom, except for occasional visits. Project literature claims that such involvement is solicited.

The original project director indicated the bilingual Title VII advisory groups functioned better at the school level than for the overall project, though they had little input on actual decisionmaking in either level. Two teacher informants felt the advisory committees are not active. Schools report their accomplishments to the committees, and that is it.

The administrator of a Chicano neighborhood house felt that community input to the Title VII bilingual project usually came after the fact. The bilingual Title VII advisory group didn't have a part in the writing of the Title VII proposal. According to the administrator, their input was purely ceremonial, seldom having much effect on the conduct of the project. He finds this to be a frequent problem with federally funded education programs. The interest of independent community organizations in bilingual education seems to have peaked four years ago and is now in decline. The issue of the moment is the proposed reorganization facing the Metropolis school district, and the campaign to replace two high school plants.

STATE AND FEDERAL RELATIONS

The federal project coordinator would welcome more direction from the Federal Title VII Program Office in Washington. Whereas the state education agency (SEA) has given the bilingual education program positive help, the coordinator has never seen the Title VII (federal) people. She does remember contact with one official, who insisted the bilingual education classes be open to non-Chicano students. Title VII federal people seldom contact the district. There is a very high turnover, and she must deal with different people all the time.

In contrast, relations with ESAA are much better, but with this agency, the coordinator deals through the regional HEW office rather than Washington. She says "the closer you are to people, the better you get along. It's simply a matter of being able to establish closer contact and better relationships with people who are geographically nearby." She insists that someone has to decide who's going to manage bilingual education: the feds, the HEW regional office, or the SEA.

PROGRAM IMPACTS

One of the principals feels the biggest result of the project has been the increase in self-esteem among the Spanish-speaking kids. The second most important effect has been an appreciation of their Spanish heritage, and third in importance is the increase in their communication skills. He noted that the bilingual classes are one-half year ahead of the other classes. This statistic is misleading, because the blacks who were bused in and who take part in the bilingual project tend to bring grades down. In other words, a segregated program would be exhibiting even greater gains.

The original project director stated that he is not sure how much good the project actually did the kids, but he thinks student attitudes toward themselves are more positive now. He feels a bilingual education project is not the total answer to the problems of the school district, but it can meet the special needs of a Mexican or Hispano-American with limited English knowledge. He feels bilingual education will be continued in Metropolis and that the school district is committed to it.

He noted that in five years the school district has matched or gone over the amount of federal funds spent on bilingual education. Title VII was the inspiration for the locally funded ESL project and the Title III staff development projects.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

Almost all informants were matter-of-fact in their expectation that the Title VII project will be continued next year without change, funded entirely without the benefit of federal funding. This was in sharp contrast to other sites, where respondents were at most very guarded about prospects for local continuance.

The assistant superintendent explained that the district's background with related programs (e. g. , ESL, SSL[*]) has promoted an amicableness toward bilingual education, so that Title VII doesn't have an aura of something that has been pushed on them by the feds or by the top district administrators. Principals have come to think of it as something they thought of themselves. He says there are some very supportive people who use their influence for bilingual education. On the school board, there is the Mexican-American lawyer; there is also the assistant area superintendent, who was project director for Title VII until the middle of this last year. The superintendent claimed there has been dedicated leadership in the early federal programs, and again the area superintendent is an example. Promotion of the project director to assistant area superintendent gave Title VII the aura of being a very important program. He also claimed that Metropolis is cosmopolitan and more attuned to accept such innovations. The state has recently shown so much interest in bilingual education, as evidenced by the new state law, that the message gets across. He said that the bilingual project has flourished in Metropolis whereas other projects have been cut back; this is partly because the district has committed some hard (i.e., local) money for the program. For example, the project director was paid half from operating funds and half from Title VII.

The superintendent claims that if the NAACP or some other civil rights group does not get a court order or other injunction against the district, they will be able to expand the bilingual project horizontally with some poise. Otherwise, if expansion is forced on the district full scale, it will cause big crises with respect to staffing; the result would be the defeat of the purpose of the project. The state legislation, which becomes effective next year, will itself create a staffing crisis. Even though the state-mandated program will initially deal only with the 1st grade, the district is hard-pressed to provide bilingual teachers next year. It intends to transfer bilingual teachers from upper grades down to the 1st grade.

The bilingual coordinator claimed that transition of the Title VII project to the regular program will be eased by Metropolis' two-way program management formula.

---

[*] Spanish as a Second Language.

On the subject of institutionalization, she went on to suggest that one threat to the possibility of an innovative program effecting permanent change is that such an intervention may become identified with the charisma of the original director or management group. She says there must be an organization structure in the district that permits the benefits of having such a strong person and provides for effective institutionalization. She says that one good strategy would be to promote the director at the time the project is to become a part of regular structure. This, in fact, happened to the original project director, although perhaps not for that reason.

The federal project coordinator was more concise, and more unsure, about the prospects for continuance. She said continuance was assured a few months ago because of a very committed, liberal school board that was sprinkled with a few minority members. Now that the board is conservative, she says there's a possibility that commitment may also change. Otherwise, the only struggle over the transfer of the project to the regular program concerns who will run it. The Title VII staff is reluctant to let it go to the regular education staff, although the latter group have been running the content aspects of the program for this past year.

The Metropolis school district submitted an application for a new Title VII proposal for next year, but because it was five days late, it was not clear at the time of the site visit whether the application would be accepted. There's also some question as to whether it would be accepted on other grounds because the feds view the new proposal as not substantially different from the old program. The main difference is that it would be in different elementary schools. The same junior and senior high schools would be served, but different kinds of subjects would be taught. One new notion is to spend more time on the monolingual English kids. The federal coordinator feels the monolingual English kids must be able to spend part of the day in a purely English setting for classes such as math and science. Other than that the same curriculum and same scheduling as the old program would be used. One aide would be provided per teacher, which would be about double the intensity of last year.

The new proposal is designed to help the implementation of the state-mandated program. It would begin with kindergarten and grade 1, and would move up one grade level per year in the 12 schools where implementation is expected to be required. It is interesting to note that the informants felt they had, in fact, proposed a different program. The bilingual coordinator confided that it had to be different if the feds were to accept it.

Even if Title VII does not come through, there may be some federal funds directed toward Spanish-dominant kids next year. The district has a Title V application under submission for three "total immersion" centers in secondary schools. In each center there would be two teachers. Students would spend either the morning or afternoon in the program for ESL and Spanish tutoring. The whole program would be in Spanish. The teachers for this project would be trained by this summer's Title III training program if that money comes through. Ten secondary schools would benefit.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Initiation/Implementation/Impact of the Project on the LEA

Two or so years before the advent of Title VII, the Metropolis school district had been administering an ESL program in certain schools. Before that, it had assigned Title I funded compensatory education teachers to deal with youngsters with limited English-speaking abilities.

When Title VII money became available, the district superintendent recruited a junior high principal to write a proposal, and to subsequently direct the project. He wrote the proposal on his own, with the help of some input from district language teachers. Community involvement, in the form of an advisory committee, was solicited after the money was granted; the advisory committee has never been a positive action group; rather it has acted as a passive bystander to whom the district reports.

There was initial opposition to the project by parents, who feared that the transition of Spanish-dominant kids would be retarded. There was also opposition from a number of principals who resisted change in general, or who denied the value of bilingual education.

The project also was faced with inadequate commercially available materials, and the scarcity of well-qualified teachers. Finally, the project director would have preferred more guidance from the Federal Title VII Program Office in Washington.

Over the five years of the project, the resistance from parents and principals has apparently ameliorated. The materials shortage has been solved by a strong materials development effort at district project staff level. Recruitment is still a problem, and is aggravated by the apparent reluctance of local universities to establish adequate bilingual training programs. Interaction with the federal Title VII offices is still less than satisfactory, but informants suggested this had more to do with their relative geographic distance (and insufficient staffing) than anything else;

there was a plea to have Title VII administered out of the regional HEW office, or some similar counterpart.

At the end of the fifth year, the project served 1600 students (mostly Mexicano and black) in eight elementary schools, one junior high, and one senior high. The elementary classrooms are self-contained and seem conventional in every respect except for the frequent instruction in Spanish; there is some cross-classroom grouping for ESL and SSL instruction. Supervision by central project staff is light, and teachers exercise considerable freedom in interpreting the project-sponsored model.

In the secondary schools, a number of elective courses are offered bilingually; the course titles are largely determined by the interests of the bilingual teachers in the two schools. There is a student motivation problem, particularly at the senior high, but the problem seems to stem less from stigma and more from disinterest in the particular courses that are offered. Most student participants are recent arrivals from Spanish-speaking countries who have difficulty in the English-only classes.

Most informants cited increases in student self-esteem as the primary impact of the project; improved communication skills was also cited. A fortuitous side effect was the project's role in materials and staff development; this puts the district in a better position to deal with the state-mandated bilingual project that begins next year.

Informants argued that an objective assessment of impact is an unfair request because of high transiency, and because of the Title VII vertical expansion model that results in fewer years of experience with upper grades, where program development problems are reputably most severe.

Impact of the LEA on the Project

Metropolis is rather segregated residentially and has long had separatist traditions. The Spanish-speaking minority has been passive toward school affairs, at least up to the time when schools ceased to be segregated. Allegedly, the district typically seeks community involvement only after-the-fact. Apparently, then as now, bilingual education was a non-issue as far as the Spanish community groups were concerned. Present interest, for example, is focused on the larger issue of the pending district reorganization.

In this context, it probably should not be surprising that the bilingual project would be initiated by the district without referring to the target community. The fact that the original project was segregated and rather transition-oriented is consistent with the district's previous, concurrent, and future investment in ESL programs.

The externally enforced school desegregation of 1972 had the effect of watering down the project by forcing it to deal with a student population of non-Spanish-dominant kids; it also precipitated the flight of many original project participants.

The district's style of federal program management, in which the regular education division plays a dominant role in curriculum aspects even before outside funding terminates, was initiated after the project began. This change has had the effect of improving relations with principals and smoothing the way for institutionalization of the project next year. In particular, it has reduced the dependence of project success on the particular characteristics of the project team.

Continuation/Dissemination

Most informants take it for granted that the project will continue next year, although there are some clouds on the horizon. First, in recent months, the composition of the school board has become financially conservative. In addition, next year's state-mandated bilingual program may require more bilingual teachers than the district can muster, even though only kindergarten and the 1st grade are to be served; the district may find it necessary to press into service some of the bilingual teachers who are now involved in Title VII and Title I ESL. Even if the project continues, there is the slight contingency that some civil liberties group might take the lead from Lau v. Nichols to sue for rapid horizontal expansion of bilingual education. This would in effect substitute a widespread inadequate project for the existing narrow, but adequate, one, again because of the scarcity of qualified teachers.

There was no evidence uncovered by the site visit to indicate that the Metropolis project has disseminated outside the district. Within the district, indirect dissemination has occurred in the sense that the project has enhanced possibilities for district-wide bilingual education, or at least an elaborated ESL program. This effect is manifested through material development, personnel training at both management and instruction levels, and more positive attitudes toward bilingual education on the part of district staff and parents; these factors will be capitalized on by the state-mandated program next year. There is also provision in the district reorganization plan for a department of bilingual education.

BAY CITY

Gerald C. Sumner and Peter W. Greenwood

The combined site-time for two fieldworkers in Bay City was 4 1/2 person days. There were four primary informants:

> The acting director of bilingual education, who was coordinator for Bay City's ESL program in the late sixties, and later helped write the original Title VII proposal and subsequently became project leader (place-bound).
>
> The acting project director, who previously taught in both of the Title VII schools (career-bound).
>
> The parent program director, who directed the parent program from its inception four years ago until this spring, when she began devoting full time to developing vocational bilingual programs (career-bound).
>
> The chairman of the state bilingual education advisory council, who was instrumental in obtaining the Title VII funding, the locally funded transitional bilingual education program, and finally the state bilingual legislation (place-bound).

In addition, we interviewed principals of the two Title VII schools, several teachers, and one parent. Observations were made in the two schools and in the parent program.

THE LEA

Bay City is a large seaport city on the East Coast. The Bay City school system consists of departments that are regulated by a hierarchy beginning with the Bay City School Board, which consists of about five elected members. There is a superintendent, and under him there are six area superintendents who cover different geographic areas of the city, and six associate superintendents who have cognizance over functional areas such as budget, personnel, bilingual education, etc.

The overall impression of the district is that it is very traditional. All the senior administrators are Irish; there is a high percentage of men in administrative posts and not too many in teaching posts. Until 1954, married women could not teach in district schools. It is the Title VII project director's opinion that in Bay City the principal and the community seem to determine the mode of instruction and the extent of innovation permitted in the classroom, and that the latitude of the teachers is fairly narrow.

One change-inhibiting factor that has existed up to the present is a teacher-hiring system that restricts principals' recruitment flexibility. Until this spring, teachers were hired by taking a national teachers' exam and an interview. They were then listed by grade and subject area specialty. When an opening came up, a principal had to take the next teacher who came up on the list. This method has been challenged as discriminatory and supposedly a new method is taking effect next year. There was a way to get around this system. If no one was appropriate on the list, a provisional teacher could be hired. First-year provisional teachers could be paid no more than starting pay, regardless of schooling and prior experience. They were automatically fired each year, but could be rehired for a maximum of three years. If within three years they were not taken off the list and put into a tenured position, or given tenure by special departmental action, they had to be terminated.

Desegregation

Bay City is now under a court order to desegregate its schools. The plan requires closing down many existing schools and moving children around by busing, mostly for short distances. The desegregation objectives are in conflict with the district's bilingual program, since it is the aim of the district to cluster together kids who need bilingual help.

Bilingual Education in Bay City Schools

The Bilingual Department. The Bilingual Department was established in 1970, one year after the Title VII project began. The department sponsors elementary and high school programs in Greek, Haitian, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Chinese, and Italian. It collects materials that will be useful for teaching different kinds of bilingual kids, produces curriculum packages, and coordinates teacher selection and training. The existence of the department attests to the fact that bilingual education is regarded as a regular curriculum service, not a special service. This mainline stand is not typical of many of the Title VII projects that we visited elsewhere.

The department has 154 persons on its staff. The staff, like the department, is all very young. All the second-line administrators are on acting status, and because of this the Bay City schools are able to pay them only teachers' salaries. All but 15 of the 150 or so teachers are provisional, which means they do not get salary credit for advanced degrees or previous experience.

Fifty teachers are of Spanish heritage, but only 17 are Puerto Rican. They have recruiting difficulties, especially for Puerto Ricans. Last year they recruited in Puerto Rico, but that was not successful. They have about 20 new Puerto Rican applicants for next year.

State-Mandated Bilingual Education. The programs administered by the bilingual department are mandated by state legislation. In 1971 the state legislature passed a law that provided for a transitional bilingual education program. This legislation provides that bilingual education must be provided if 20 or more kids of limited English-speaking ability (but with the same dominant language) attend a given school district. The law has never been particularly specific about what the transitional model should consist of, but it requires a 15-1 student-teacher ratio if there is one teacher in the classroom, or at most a 20-2 ratio if there are a teacher and an aide in the classroom.* Transitional bilingual education is a three-year, half-day program and presumably includes cultural transition as well as bilingual transition. The law provides that the local district must provide a bilingual program out of its own funds; the state then reimburses the district for costs that exceed the average cost of educating students in the regular program.

The chairman of the state Bilingual Advisory Council says that Bay City doesn't yet have full coverage of target groups, mostly because state law requires the city to pay, then be reimbursed. Thus, the city must raise taxes, which it is somewhat reluctant to do right now because of the economic situation. He said the city is moving toward full coverage and expects to have it by 1976. He said Bay City sometimes moves in a slow fashion; they have had their racial balance law for ten years, but the city is still not balanced according to that law.

He notes that a number of people have objected to the transitional aspects of the legislation, and for that reason the state Bilingual Advisory Council is pushing for legislation that will allow for teaching foreign languages in grades 1-12 rather than high school only, as is now permitted by state law. This would allow language teaching to proceed directly after the end of the transitional program in each qualifying school.

---

*In practice, class sizes are often much greater due to an influx of new students after the term begins.

One parent we interviewed noted a related problem with the half-day transitional programs. She complained that in some Bay City transitional programs (in which only persons of the non-English background participate) the kids resist leaving the comfortable fold of the transitional program to attend half-day regular classes such as art and social studies.

Title VII Project Sites

Claiborne School. Claiborne is a small three-story building with a locked sheet-metal door. To gain admittance, you ring a bell, and a monitor on the other side observes you through a small window four inches square. The school is located in a rundown section: deserted buildings, few businesses, and a lot of people hanging around on the streets, sitting on stoops with nothing to do. The school has the services of a community worker one day a week whom they can send out to see parents. Teachers are discouraged from going out alone into the community, because of the apparent danger. The assistant principal is the last one in the building every night--even the janitor doesn't want to be left there alone.

Claiborne is one of four schools administered by the same principal, who headquarters at another school. The assistant principal has no office; he sits at a desk in the first floor hallway. The hallways have books and tables and materials on the wall, and small groups of kids meet there for instruction. Despite the foregoing description, the school seemed cheerful, more so than Newton School, the other project site. The school itself simply looks much more lively than the other ones that were visited.

It was our impression that the principal doesn't see the need for the bilingual aide. She feels that the kids do need to make contact with an adult, but it doesn't have to be a Spanish-speaking adult.

Newton School. Newton serves an attendance area that years ago was rather high-class, mostly townhouses. Recently there has been white flight; low-income blacks moved into the area, and the neighborhood generally deteriorated. In very recent years there has been a large influx of middle-class, mostly white families. They are attracted by the nearness to downtown, the rather picturesque townhouses, and probably most of all by cheap government loans that have been provided to persons who will renovate the townhouses. Many of the new families want the kids to have a "public school multicultural experience," so they are very firmly behind the bilingual programs. Most of the educational innovation in the attendance area has resulted from the lobbying and organizing activities of the middle-class mothers. One such mother claimed that the parents in the neighborhood are very interested and involved in school matters because in that attendance area in particular, and in the Bay City school system in general, parents must be responsible for change--the administration is locked into its traditional ways.

There are actually three schools under the same principal in the Newton attendance area. The Title VII bilingual program and a traditional school are housed in the Newton building. There is a so-called nongraded open school in another building, Browne School. A third building, Holden School, houses a traditional program. Parents may choose which of these three schools their child may attend.

In the case of the bilingual program, the impetus came down through the Title VII organization. They were able to convince the principal to give them one wing of a school plus several other classrooms. For the most part the bilingual organization essentially runs its own program. In the case of the open school at Browne, the impetus was a large group of new middle-class, highly educated parents who had access to information on educational innovation. They politicked and lobbied until they were finally successful in getting the district to establish an open school in the Browne building. There was only one teacher on the staff at that time who was particularly interested or who had experience in open school. Two other teachers were talked into volunteering, but they went back to traditional classrooms after the first year. There are currently six ungraded and two traditional classrooms at Browne.

The parents of Browne students are still fairly active, and there is a core group of about 30 or 40 who meet each week. On the other hand, parents of kids in the bilingual and traditional schools at Newton are not particularly active, although there is a school advisory committee that makes minor policy recommendations.

Newton School is relatively new, but dismal looking. There is no play equipment outside, so when the kids go to recess they are simply turned loose on a macadam field. The kids also seem restless in the classroom. They are continually jumping and wiggling around, and have a hard time concentrating.

The principal at Browne and Newton noted that there was no bilingual problem in the attendance area until recent years, when Puerto Ricans began to move in. He credits the efforts of certain people about 1970 with bringing into existence a whole procession of bilingual programs.

One big problem he says exists in the Newton School Building is with staff absences which too often put students at the mercy of substitute teachers. Student discipline has been a problem, although he noted that disciplinary action has eased off lately because of what he termed the advent of the permissive society.

CURRENT PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The bilingual project under Title VII offers a mixture of Spanish and English language training and cultural exposure, both to native Spanish-speakers and native English-speakers in the classroom.

The Puerto Rican population served by the program is highly mobile, both between attendance areas within Bay City, and between Bay City and Puerto Rico. Yearly turnover in the program is about 50 percent. A majority of the kids come from single parent families.

There are fourteen teachers and nine aides serving about 225 kids, about 40 percent of whom are not primarily Spanish-speaking. There is also a project director, and a director/teacher for the parent program. Most teachers have done graduate work in Spanish and/or have taught in foreign countries. Teachers are provided with certain benefits regular teachers don't get, such as field trips, jazzy materials, and weekly staff meetings.

The program operates in two elementary schools--Claiborne School, covering grades 1 through 4, and Newton School, grades 1 through 5.

The two schools in the project supposedly work quite differently. At Newton, the principal believes that the Bilingual Title VII Project is the project director's to run, and he pretty much keeps his hands off. Claiborne School is heavily principal-directed. The principal feels strongly that all that happens in the building and all the special programs are her personal responsibility. She doesn't like to see her school divided up by diverse programs, so she encourages program interaction and mutual use of services even though it means the funds are used for nontarget group students. Her approach in this respect seems to be 180 degrees from that of the principal at Newton. This has its advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand it provides for a more integrated school, and on the other it restricts the freedom of the Title VII staff to design a program.

At Newton, for example, it is pretty much up to the project to pick teachers when replacements have to be made; at Claiborne, the project director submits a number of nominations to the principal, who makes the final choice.

The state Bilingual Advisory Council chairman feels that Bay City has not yet tried the entire range of possibilities that might be used under Title VII. He believes that it is a rather conservative program, but that this is largely because of the problem of dealing with the administration, the principals, and with existing school facilities. Because of this conservatism he put his own kid in the Open School at Browne, even though he was one of the original instigators of the bilingual project.

Claiborne School

Claiborne School is relatively small, with grades 1-4. Virtually the whole school is bilingual because Title VII target classrooms constitute most of the school anyway. Besides the Title VII bilingual program there is some bilingual education for other language groups that fall under other funding.

Five classrooms are in the bilingual project; two 1st grade classrooms, and one each for 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grades. There are also four regular classrooms: kindergarten, one 2nd grade, one 3rd grade, and a special education classroom, called the resource room. The school has nine homeroom teachers, two language specialists for Title VII, one ESL teacher who is funded by Title I, a part-time speech therapist, an assistant principal, and four bilingual aides (one for each graded level).

There is considerable sharing in the school between the regular classrooms and the bilingual classrooms. Bilingual project materials and teachers are traded in exchange for Title I services and other support services provided independently to the school.

In each grade, the homeroom teacher provides math and English reading for all English-speaking kids and some of the Spanish speakers. A language specialist pulls the Spanish-speaking kids out of the room for Spanish reading in two or three small groups. At one time or another all kids are pulled out for either Title I remedial reading in English or ESL. The language specialist or homeroom teacher provide SSL. All of the children are together for Puerto Rican history and culture-related activities. Depending on the subject matter, the homeroom teacher may split kids up into small groups within the classroom. This pattern is repeated for all grade levels.

They originally intended participants to be evenly split between English and Spanish dominant. They haven't been able to follow that goal, because the attendance area has become about 80 percent Puerto Rican in the past five years.

No use is made of audio equipment; there are no tape recorders or records for language learning. The assistant principal claims that the problem here is theft. They can't keep any equipment for more than a couple of days.

Newton School

The bilingual school at Newton is housed in its own wing. It has its own recess yard, but bilingual participants are allowed to use the larger school yard during cafeteria break. Participants are almost all Puerto Rican. Newton doesn't have the support services that Claiborne has; Title VII is therefore more self-sufficient. There is an ESL teacher, but that teacher works only with kids in the traditional school program.

One of the problems at Newton was the diverse ability levels of the kids for various language arts subjects. For this reason they developed seven ability levels in the bilingual program for language arts, and kids spend part of their day grouped accordingly.

There are five grades in the program--grades 1-5. There is one homeroom for each grade, and a homeroom teacher for each. There are also two language specialists. Duties of language specialists are similar to those of teachers; the former simply have no classroom. During the course of the day there are three periods, which are called "switches," in which the kids are grouped according to ability level rather than homeroom. The first switch is at 9:00 for Spanish reading, the second at 11:00 for English reading, and the third at 1:00 for ESL and SSL (this period is mostly oral drill). The switches each last 50 minutes. Between switches, before the first switch, and after the last switch, the kids return to their homeroom. In the homeroom they receive instruction in math, social studies, handwriting and other subjects that are not covered in the switches.

According to one teacher informant, teachers in the bilingual project are free to design their own instructional technique. The same informant criticized the project by saying there is little direction given teachers on the organization of the delivery system, and little coordination of individual efforts of teachers.

Parent Program

There is also a program for parents of Newton kids in the Title VII program. They go to a morning class at Sattler School (two blocks from Newton) and get paid up to $40 a month for their participation in the parent program. A teacher provides for literacy needs, but there is also a heavy focus on acclimating Puerto Rican parents to the U. S. culture. Native English mothers also have a separate Spanish class, although some English-speaking mothers elect instead to attend the class for Spanish mothers and help with tutoring. On Thursdays, parents visit their children's classrooms in Newton School. The parent program provides a bridge to help clear up kids' problems that are really home-related.

The parent program is exclusively at Newton School because that principal was supportive and provided space.

INITIATION

In 1969, a VISTA volunteer discovered the availability of Title VII money. She got together with two community workers, a person from the mayor's office, and the present acting director of bilingual education, Jane Rowe. Together they worked on a Title VII proposal. The superintendent gave Ms. Rowe some time to do the proposal writing. She was successful in getting a planning grant to write a final proposal and they hired a university professor to help with the proposal writing. They sent him to Puerto Rico for a time to research materials and the educational program there.

IMPLEMENTATION

General Operations

Browne (Newton attendance area) and Claiborne schools were chosen as Title VII sites because they have the appropriate target populations, and because there is a strong contrast between the upwardly mobile area served by Newton and the strife-torn area served by Claiborne, which has the whole range of inner city problems of racial disturbances, declining neighborhoods, and low income.

First Year. Before the start of the first year of the Title VII project, two technical assistants were sent from Washington; they were very helpful in organizing and getting the project going. The local Title VII staff brought in their own curriculum specialist. The project began in 1st grade only, with a teacher and an aide for each homeroom. One grade level was added each year.

Project staff initially viewed the project as an integrated five-year program. During the first year, however, it became apparent that the population was so mobile that the focus must change to dealing with each year separately. This student mobility and transiency appeared in all grade levels, and it was impossible to count on building on skills that were developed in the previous year.

In fact, one of the project's biggest problems is the influx of kids from Puerto Rico in the middle of the year, which even causes difficulties with the single-year-package focus. The influx of new students tends to be before Christmas and on into the winter months. They don't get Puerto Ricans from other states as much as they do from the island itself. Turnover tends to be both to and from Puerto Rico and other parts of Bay City.

Project personnel felt that the program should be designed to be more like instructional programs in Puerto Rico to provide continuity when kids arrive or go back to Puerto Rico, or even when they leave the Title VII project and move into the regular Bay City school system. In other words, the Title VII project needed to be rather traditional and to use some of the same reading and Spanish series that are used in Puerto Rico.

Second Year. After the first year, project personnel began to worry because the program was putting the target group into isolation, so during the second year they did some team teaching (pairing bilingual teachers with regular program teachers) at Claiborne School. They also made more efforts to bring regular staff members into the workshop and to share field trips with regular program kids.

When the Open School was organized, it was housed in the Browne building, along with the bilingual project, and the two were not felt to be compatible. Puerto Rican kids come from a very strict traditional kind of educational background, and since many of them will at some time return to Puerto Rico, it was felt that they should be kept in more traditional classes. For this reason, the Title VII program moved two blocks to the Newton building, where they could remain in more traditional classes.

The Newton parent program also began in the second year of the bilingual project, apparently when Title VII made new money available for that purpose.

Third Year. During the third year, major change was mandated by the federal program office when they began to worry about the segregation effect. At this time they required the Bay City project to include at least 40 percent Anglos. Although that ratio has not persisted, the project has remained open to native English speakers. This additional group with its own set of needs further taxed the existing staffing arrangement, so one language specialist (i.e., teacher-without-homeroom) was added at each school.

Team teaching began at Newton. At Claiborne, sharing of services with regular staff, including language specialists, began. It was the principal who wanted the sharing. She thought this was especially appropriate since there were only three regular classrooms; she could see no sense in restricting Title I services to three classrooms, nor in denying regular classrooms the services of the bilingual funded aide.

Fourth Year. An additional language specialist was added in each school. At Newton, they also began limited sharing across grade levels; that is, combining kids from different grade levels into small groups by ability levels. In-service training meetings were used to determine and organize these teaming arrangements.

Fifth Year. In the fifth year the cross-grade sharing at Newton School was expanded to include grade levels 1-5, rather than the 1st with the 2nd and the 3rd with the 4th. Again, the sharing was based on skill levels, regardless of grade level for the following subjects: reading in English, reading in Spanish, ESL, and SSL.

At Newton, the increased pupil load in the fifth year required pullouts to be in larger groups than desired. The language specialist at Claiborne is still able to pull out kids in small groups because there are so many other pullouts and support services that the school receives.

The project director claimed that in the last year there was a new development, particularly in the 5th grade, in that Hispanic parents were putting their non-Spanish-speaking kids into the program to learn fluency in Spanish. These kids are typically from other Bay City schools that don't have bilingual programs. They come into the attendance area and opt for a bilingual program rather than the other two, even though they may be native English speakers.

At the end of the fifth year, the principal seems to feel that the project has been intrusive in Claiborne. The principal at Newton noted that, aside from some interstaff jealousy, there was no other problem associated with incorporating the bilingual program into the school. This is reasonable since, for all practical purposes, the project is an independent unit within the school building.

Materials. The Bay City Title VII program did not propose a large curriculum development component. The project director said they preferred to experiment with commercially available materials. On the other hand, a great deal of effort was expended in curriculum development or adaptation of these commercial materials, usually on the staff's private time. The prepackaged stuff doesn't really fit. The Puerto Rican kids, who are very mobile, come from a rural environment in Puerto Rico; they haven't had much education and may not even have been going to school.

Title VII provides for a pre-service training program which the project director believes was invaluable for getting the project organized and preparing self-help development materials. Because of the strong needs for self-development material, she believes that it is important to hire teachers who will be willing to put in that extra time.

She was critical of the testing instruments used in the program. Three tests are used: the Inter-American Spanish Achiever Test, the MAT (Michigan Achievement Test), and the Michigan Oral Test.

She feels that the Spanish standardized test (Inter-American) is bad in about all respects. For example, it is almost impossible to identify what the pictures represent in many of the test items, let alone match to the proper response. Only two or three skills are tested, as contrasted with the MAT test in which several skills are tested. Also, the Inter-American test does not begin at an easy enough level to show that some progress has been made. Even the easiest items in the test targeted for the 1st grade pretest would cause difficulty for 3rd graders.

No test has been developed specifically for ESL students, so they use the MAT, but the MAT is not culturally appropriate. For example, one of the test items deals with a story concerning the Trojan Horse. The project director feels this story would have little meaning for Puerto Ricans. Also, she is critical because directions are not provided in Spanish.

The Michigan Oral Test is a 25-minute test given individually to each kid, but the project director believes that there are too many similar examples in about 40 items in the test. The instructions for teacher direction are unclear. The test doesn't test enough different concepts. It asks questions that favor kids with good imaginations. For example, a kid might be asked, "What is longer, a meter or a yard?" when the point of the question has nothing to do with their knowledge of meters and yards, but some aspect of language ability.

Staff. The project director claims that the bilingual project has developed a decentralized model for policymaking in that teachers are involved in designing the delivery system, in decisions to change and in the implementation of change. As noted previously, however, one teacher informant complained that the project administrators do not listen to teachers, at least not to her.

The project conducts a pre-service workshop and in-service sessions that meet ten times during the semester. For the first four years of the project, a Puerto Rican psychologist worked with teachers regarding their problems and attitudes toward work, kids, parents, and other staff. The department director believes that the psychologist was helpful, but many of the staff did not agree, especially those who didn't take easily to the suggestion that some problems might be with the teacher rather than with the kids.

Some teachers are understandably resentful about having to be hired as provisional teachers, because their salaries may be $2000 or $3000 less than regular teachers with similar qualifications. This is especially galling, considering the extra time that must be expended. The principal of Newton School noted that all bilingual teachers work after school on materials or instruction planning, often spending one or two hours a night; he said this would be very unusual for teachers in the traditional school.

Recruitment of Hispanic teachers is a problem. Matching ethnicity of staff to target population is next to impossible. Until very recent years, there were perhaps only two or three Puerto Rican high school graduates each year in all of Bay City. The recruitment problem is currently being alleviated in a small way by the Teacher Corps, which is training 35 latinos to be classroom teachers.

Parent Program

The Puerto Rican community does not appear to be well organized politically. It does not take much interest in the program. There are not many services for them outside of the schools. The kids in the program come from very parochial kinds of households--generally the mother has migrated to Bay City to be with some other family member. They are afraid to let their kids go out, so they tend to keep them in the house most of the day. The kids come to school and they haven't been exposed to very much. The teachers, as a group, have attempted to provide varied learning experiences for their students. Some parents permit the teachers to take their kids on field trips, but only if they are quite familiar with the teacher.

At Newton School, a separate adult education program was set up in 1970 to teach Spanish reading to some of the parents. There are twenty or thirty participants. Besides just attempting to provide language fluency, the adult program also attempts to familiarize parents with public services in Bay City--transportation, health services, consumer education. The teachers at Newton claim that this program is vital to them because it helps them find out more about the kids and makes it possible to communicate to parents the needs of kids at home.

The parent program has an administrator, who is also the teacher. She is assisted by one or two college student volunteers. In the first year of the parent program, she brought parents to visit the classroom. This visit amounted mostly to observing; there was very little participation because parents had too few skills to function in the capacity of teacher aides. During that first year, parents were asked to tutor their kids at home, for which they received $20 a month. However, in the process of her home visits, the teacher discovered that, for the most part, parents were at the same or even lower scholastic skill levels than their kids. Many of the parents seemed to want to be educated themselves. Many had never gone to school, so it became apparent that a special classroom was needed for parents. The following year (1971-72) the project was able to get a classroom in a community building which they kept for two years. The fourth year, they were given classroom space in another school about one block from Newton.

In the second year, ESL was offered to the Puerto Rican parents, and SSL was offered to English-speaking parents (who meet in a separate group). Most activities of the parent program that take part outside of the classroom require the director to provide bus service, otherwise the activities could not take place. In addition, mothers visit the Newton classrooms on Thursday and assist in the various special programs and projects that the bilingual project administers.

At the end of four years, the parent group has grown into an organization that more or less functions as a parent advisory group. It is primarily a resource group that supports certain classroom activities in the regular bilingual project, but it also contributes to bilingual project policy and Newton school policy. For example, some of the mothers now sit on the Newton advisory committee, which has fought for and gained changes in the discipline policy and teacher parking. With respect to the bilingual project itself, at various times of the year (such as continuation proposal writing time) the project draws on the nucleus of parents who have had kids in the program over a period of time and have generally been active on the program.

The parent program at Newton has been a full-time job because there are so many administrative and social work type activities in addition to the classroom activities. They did try to get a program for Claiborne in the second year, but the principal wasn't too interested, because Claiborne had funding from other sources such as Title I that provide somewhat similar services.

Extra-Project Relations

Regular Staff. The principal of Newton noted some jealousy between the staff of the traditional school with respect to the bilingual program because bilingual teachers get more perquisites, such as field trips and materials that are paid from federal funds. A project teacher at Newton said she had felt no resentment from the teachers in the traditional school, but had felt some from the principal.

The principal of Claiborne was candid about her doubts of the project, but she has molded it to needs as she sees them. She sees no need for a bilingual staff.

Federal Title VII Office. The bilingual director complained that, in general, there seems to be an abnormally high staff turnover in federal program offices. In the five years with Title VII, Bay City has had five or six federal project monitors. With this transiency there is no real support or real criticism of the project in the field. Also, the federal Title VII program office is understaffed. She says it's nice to have some degree of independence, but the projects, especially the new ones, do need a system of accountability.

The project director said that the most important need is for more interaction among the Title VII projects, or at least more information about what other projects are doing, especially those with the same target groups. She says that experience with Title VII needs to be disseminated.

In Title VII she believes that a lot of money is spent that is not for the good of the kids; her main example was testing. She says that everyone agrees the tests are bad, but the people who make the decisions to use the tests, at local as well as federal levels, apparently don't want to listen or they are just too rigid in their ways.

She feels that if the feds paid more attention to evaluation, they could see that something is wrong, and that what is wrong might have more to do with the testing and test instruments than with the programs themselves.

Finally, she believes that Puerto Rico should have more bilingual programs that are parallel to those on the Eastern seaboard, since there is so much mobility between the two locations.

Impact of the Project on the LEA

The project staff did not claim that there had been much impact on the target population. There are apparently improvements in self-concept, but this is not fully documented. Increases in communications skills are cited, but not unanimously. The principal of Newton complained that Title VII kids are not learning English, that it would be better to have more focus on ESL. He discussed at length how emphasis on culture has not been necessary for Chinese students, some of whom have excelled in secondary school. He claims that the goal of the bilingual program is to get the kids to function in a traditional classroom; there is no clear test or criteria, however, to describe when they have met this goal.

The project director emphasized the wider impacts of the Title VII project on the rest of the district. She noted that the Title VII program has stressed reading and language arts development very heavily, and she says this has served as a model for the transitional bilingual education program that was developed by the city prior to the state-mandated program. In particular, the city relied on the Title VII program in setting up a program where reading instruction was provided in both languages rather than just English. It also relied on Title VII as a proving ground for educational materials, pupil-teacher ratios, staffing pattern, training techniques, and classroom schedule. Finally, there was an impact in that many of the administrators for the citywide bilingual education program had their on-the-job training in the Title VII program.

The chairman of the state Bilingual Council agrees that these wider impacts had occurred. He noted that the transitional program and the Title VII project differ in that Title VII is a lot more experimental and has the money to be able to try different things. He believes that the city and the state look to Title VII for new ideas. For example, next year the state Bilingual Advisory Council will push for integration in the transitional program reflecting the success with integration with the Title VII project.

Impact of the LEA on the Project

The impact of the LEA has been noted above. Classroom organization and operation were strongly affected by the particular characteristics of the principals in the host schools. The program at Newton was almost separatist in its isolation, whereas at Claiborne the program almost disappeared as a separately identifiable entity. The contrast illustrates the independence apparently enjoyed by Bay City principals.

The prevailing conservative Bay City sociopolitical mood seems to have reinforced traditional aspects of the program (i. e., transition-oriented elements such as ESL).

The establishment of a Department of Bilingual Education was fortunate from the standpoint of maintaining the project's vigor during the five-year period, and in disseminating various aspects of the project experience to other district programs that are targeted on non-English speakers.

DISSEMINATION/CONTINUATION

Dissemination of Bilingual Education to State Level

The influence of particular aspects of the Title VII project on other Bay City bilingual programs has been described. How this influence took form is an interesting story.

A great deal of bilingual education organizing activity occurred from 1968 to the spring of 1971. Planning and implementation of the Title VII project began in 1968 and 1969. In the fall of 1969, the Bay City School Board established a citywide program with transitional goals. In 1970, a Department of Bilingual Education was organized in the district. In 1971, the state mandated a transitional bilingual program for schools with non-English-speaking populations. All of this activity was related.

According to the bilingual education director, it seems that there were simply some people who came together to push bilingual education, and the timing (politically and economically) was appropriate. One force that militated for the rapid expansion of bilingual education was a very strong education movement that existed at that time.

Some legislators were prominent in this effort. The director noted that the state legislature takes a strong role in advocating new educational causes. The Bay City School Board supported the bilingual movement financially, probably because it was influenced by a study that called attention to the large number of kids who were out of school and the fact that many students with foreign language backgrounds just didn't seem to be learning.

Most important, however, was the core group of organizers, a "successful combination of people who were able to get things done."

This group got together on its own volition, and in the director's words "we got something together." Membership of the group changed depending on what phase of bilingual growth they were working on; however, they had for the most part known each other since around 1966 and had worked together on ESL. It was a natural transition to move on to Title VII and other bilingual development work.

One very important development in all this process was the establishment in 1970 of the Bay City School Department of Bilingual Education, which was important if only because it created the post of director of bilingual education. It was also very helpful that the bilingual department was not constrained too much to follow rules; it was new and staffed by younger persons who weren't locked into bureaucracy, and at that time there was a sense of urgency about the bilingual education programs.

Continuation

Title VII Project. The bilingual director noted there might be two interpretations of a Title VII project--either as a change agent or as an isolated pilot project. She feels that their bilingual project was more successful as a change agent by virtue of the time she and her staff spent in setting up other bilingual programs for the city. They more or less fell into this role naturally because they were the leaders of the initial bilingual project and the only ones with experience. As for the Title VII project as a pilot project, she doesn't expect that it will either expand or persist in its present form in the present host school.

Two major external factors are making it almost impossible for the current Title VII project to be continued with local funds. The court-approved desegregation plan for 1974-75 will result in scattering bilingual program participants to several different schools.[*]

The other main problem is the school reorganization plan that will go into effect next year: kids will be reassigned from what is now the elementary, junior high, and senior high into elementary, middle, and high. Therefore, even if busing for integration doesn't come about, there will be considerable movement. Newton Elementary will be moved en masse to another school facility.[**]

The state Bilingual Education Council chairman is less pessimistic. He says he is campaigning to get the bilingual project, storefront school, and the open school into the Browne High School complex next year. He believes that under this arrangement the bilingual project may loosen up. He says the chances for this arrangement look good even though district administrators think that he and his cohorts are crazy. He says there is a lot of creative conflict in the Newton attendance area, but that this has been advantageous in getting parents together and pushing for education innovation.

The parent program will certainly end when Title VII funding ends. The service that has been provided apparently is not duplicated elsewhere in school and city government. There is a citywide ESL program for adults, but it doesn't include the broad range of services they were provided in the parent program. In addition, the project director feels that the citywide ESL program presumes that the adults are educated, but simply not in English; whereas many of the parents dealt with in the parent program have had minimal schooling, even in their native country.

Bilingual Education in Bay City. Continuance of at least transition bilingual education is assured, thanks to the state-mandated program. Nevertheless, the bilingual department director has reservations.

One of her primary worries is whether the mayor and school board will want to pay for the bilingual expansion that has been mandated. The state pays for this bilingual expansion on a reimbursement basis, which means that the city must first raise taxes in order to finance the program. She also anticipates that the state may soon be taking some steps backward in bilingual education now that the initial excitement has worn off, and now that the economic situation has taken a rather bad turn.

---

[*] In fact, the bilingual department was able to avoid this outcome by invoking the need for keeping bilingual students together as a condition of implementing the state law on bilingual education. In 1974-75 the district decided to keep children together for bilingual programs.

[**] Despite these problems, the programs were continued in the new location during 1974-75, although on a reduced scale.

She feels that there is still a lot of work to do on improving the model of the delivery system, for example, the proportion of time spent in Spanish versus English instruction.

Another issue is whether three years is long enough for the state bilingual programs. She would like to see a full maintenance program including grades 1-12, but she is not sure whether it is feasible politically. She feels that the 1971 bilingual legislation was facilitated by a favorable political and economic condition which existed at that time. Now with inflation and some political problems she is not optimistic about future expansion of the bilingual legislation.

Among changes for next year, she mentioned there would be a standard reading test designed for all Bay City bilingual programs which would include tracking progress for grades 1-5, as part of a uniform progress reporting system which will make it easier to accommodate the kids who migrate from one attendance area to the other within a school district. The text that will be used for this program has already been in use in the Title VII bilingual project.

The bilingual department is preparing a proposal for a new project next year--career education for junior high school students. The proposal has to be for curriculum support rather than regular curriculum, because regular bilingual instruction is provided for under state law.

COMMENTS ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION ISSUES

Broader Target Group Needs

The project director feels that the big problem in bilingual education is how to provide for kids of varying academic experience at the same grade level. But she believes that programs located in the inner city must include nutrition services, exposure to health services, exposure to the larger community, even simply how to use subways. These needs are not provided for in home life. Often it turns out that the bilingual teacher is the only educated bilingual speaker the family knows, so the teachers often find themselves called upon to fill social worker roles (helping parents deal with welfare case workers, hospital clinics, or the like).

Individualized Instruction

Instructional management systems that allow for more individualized instruction are not appropriate for the target group in Bay City, the project director believes, because these kids receive little complementary education experience at home. She says most of these management systems are also too expensive for the bit city material allotments, and the city can't have expensive equipment that is required because there is so much vandalism and theft. Effective individualized instruction is an organic problem, not merely a question of materials development in Spanish.

Parent Advisory Committees

The parent program administrator notes in retrospect that the parent component as described in the original proposal seems to be too much of a middle-class concept. Conventional wisdom suggested that the program involve visiting homes, organizing parents, and getting various committee work going in support of the bilingual project at Newton School. But it became clear that a whole range of parents' personal needs had to be accommodated as a prerequisite to establishing a parent organization. Not the least of these was some kind of group socialization, because people in the community were isolated. The program therefore moved more toward cooking classes and the like, and used this as a device to get parents into each other's homes and begin the socialization process. Even so it took a long time to develop mutual rapport among the parents. The administrator had the additional problem of gaining the confidence of parents. She said that few parents have Spanish-reading competence above the 5th grade level, making English communication skills all the harder to obtain. She emphasized that there is a need to satisfy the basic social and academic needs before it's possible to get parents to contribute to the project, say as members of a parent advisory committee.

Ethnicity of Project Directors

A representative of the Federal Title VII Office told the Bay City project director and other project directors at a regional meeting that it is not particularly necessary for the project director to be bilingual, let alone bicultural. That makes sense to the Bay City director since so much of her time is spent negotiating with principals and district officers. She thinks a primary quality for the project director is the ability to run a program in the inner-city setting and to deal with the established school administration. A bicultural staff is important at the teaching level.

Evaluators

Another complaint directed toward evaluators in general was that when they come around they always seem to have their agenda of information and test scores that must be corrected, but they never have time for the teacher's comments or criticisms of test instruments, etc. If they did take the time, the project director said, they might learn something. She complained that no one asks the teachers or the kids. Teacher participation comes in during field testing or evaluating, but no input is asked for into the evaluation design. The failure to seek input from the line organization is apparently pervasive. One project teacher at Newton made a similar complaint about the administration of the bilingual project.

Allocation of Federal Funds Within Projects

The chairman of the state Bilingual Education Council complained that federal programs spend so much money on their project administrators that it causes dissension in the local school administrations. He believes that federal project salaries should be variable and should be set to match the local scale.

He believes that rather than pay somebody for external consulting and technical assistance, the federal government should involve itself more in trying to adjust the local or administrative structure so that change can be more permanent. He suggested that money might be spent on an organization team that would work with local and state government to institutionalize change (for example, by better utilizing revenue-sharing funds). He says the feds make the mistake of looking at local officials as representatives of particular target groups that are to be addressed. He believes federal programs should take care not to penalize LEAs that already have a viable program by making them ineligible for funds.

SEASIDE

Beverly J. Hawkins and Gerald C. Sumner

INTRODUCTION

Seaside is a large Western city and a major industrial center. In the city of Seaside and, in fact, throughout the Southwest, the Spanish-speaking population is predominantly Mexican-American; this population is heavily concentrated in West Seaside.

The Seaside school district (1970), in an attempt to improve the quality of education in the schools in West Seaside, implemented the Title VII program in four public schools and three parochial schools.* The student population of these schools was and still is 90 percent or more Mexican-American.

The families of these children tend to be large and in many cases below the poverty level. While many neighborhoods have stable residential patterns, many of them are receiving areas for families immigrating from Mexico seeking employment and a better way of life.

Although the Title VII program is now functioning in four schools in West Seaside, this does not even begin to solve the problems of the majority of the Spanish-speaking students in the area. There are five high schools, five junior high schools, and thirty-two elementary schools in the area with predominantly Mexican-American student bodies. There are also other parts of Seaside where schools enroll large numbers of Mexican-American students. Whatever the final evaluation of the Title VII program, it is at present only a first step toward reaching the students who might appropriately benefit from bilingual instruction.

The basic format and many of the concepts in the Title VII bilingual program grew out of the district's experience with the Arthur Complex in West Seaside. The Arthur Complex was funded by Title III in 1968 in an attempt to find innovative solutions to the educational problems plaguing schools in predominantly Spanish-speaking areas. The Complex consisted of Arthur High and its feeder schools on the elementary and junior high level.

The bilingual component of the Arthur Complex was coordinated by the present Title VII coordinator. This was the district's first effort to provide a program of bilingual education for Spanish-speaking students. In 1968, the first year Title VII funds were available, the school district submitted a proposal to DHEW for

---

*Two of the parochial schools, because of difficulties meeting certain guidelines, were subsequently dropped from the program.

Title VII funds to implement a "bilingual program" in a designated school. The proposal was turned down by DHEW because it was not specific enough about the goals and objectives of the program. In addition, the proposal was not for a true bilingual program; it was actually a reading program with a small cultural component that was called a "bicultural program." In other words, there was no significant difference between the bilingual proposal submitted in 1968 and the existing reading programs in Seaside schools with a high concentration of Spanish-speaking students. The action by DHEW was a shock and a blow to the district's pride, especially after the favorable federal evaluation of the bilingual component of the Arthur Complex. Still worse, Title VII was largely aimed at the West and Southwest, and Seaside had one of the largest target populations in the area.

In reaction to the rejection of the proposal and as a result of an increased realization of the need for bilingual education, a directive was issued from district headquarters in the spring of 1969 to set up a strong comprehensive bilingual program. Several Chicano teachers and administrators were conscripted, and the group began working on goals and a structure for a bilingual program.

At the time that this group began to work out the various aspects of the bilingual program, there were no specific funds available for implementation. Then the school district received word of the availability of Title VII funds. The superintendent for Area Y in the west part of the district was called and told about the availability of these funds. In response to this initial call, the principals of four schools in the district indicated an interest in having a bilingual education program. Two parochial schools were also involved. Initially, only two of the public schools participating in the bilingual education program were Title I schools; now all four of them are. Currently, four schools in Area Y are involved in the bilingual program; one parochial school dropped out.

In 1969, after the area superintendent learned about the bilingual education funds, a $40,000 planning grant was advanced. The planning phase involved the school community, which included principals and teachers, and the community at large, which included Chicano activist groups and others who had an interest in the education of the Spanish-speaking child, such as community organizations and church-affiliated groups. The parents of children in the West Seaside area also participated in the planning. The community was subsequently informed of the planning meetings through radio, television, and the newspapers.

The proposal, when first written, included components for materials, budget, staff development, and community. Many teachers who were not bilingual were taken aback at the end of the planning stage when they realized the program sought to phase out all personnel in the four schools who were not bilingual.[*] The teachers removed because they were not Spanish-speaking would be assigned to other schools in the district.

During the first year, because of limited supplies and resources, many schools were forced to go to team teaching in order to maintain a bilingual instructional method for all courses. Team teaching allowed a teacher who spoke only English to team with another teacher who was bilingual. There was also heavy reliance on the abilities of bilingual aides. With bilingual aides and team teaching, most of the subjects could be taught in both English and Spanish.

The first year of the program, 1970, included only kindergarten and 1st grade; each subsequent year the program included an additional grade. The program has been in existence now for four years, and it includes kindergarten through the 4th grade. In 1974-75 the program will add both 5th and 6th grades.

In-service training was also written in the initial proposal. The school coordinator now conducts the mini-in-service training sessions as needed. These are evaluated together with other in-service training that is conducted for all teachers in the four project schools. In 1973-74, the fourth year of the project, the in-service training sessions have been expanded to include music and cultural activities. The training program separates teachers new to the program from those who are experienced in the program. It was felt that teachers new to the bilingual education program needed to learn more about the goals and philosophy of the program.

PROGRAM CONTENT

English as a Second Language (ESL) versus the Bilingual Education Model

The Seaside project allowed for a great deal of flexibility and variance. The model provided a basic framework for instruction, but made no attempt to standardize all aspects of the bilingual education program, either in the four schools or in the individual classrooms. Variations on the model were more apt to result from different schoolwide priorities and attitudes than from individual teacher differences. In essence, each of the four schools adopted a variation of the basic model. Teachers within that school were allowed flexibility, but they followed the basic format of their school's version of the model.

---

[*] Although this was the information advanced during interviews with district personnel, it is not completely accurate. No provisions were made to phase out administrative personnel at these schools--specifically, principals and vice principals.

One reason why there were no severe problems with the bilingual education model in the four schools was that all of the principals were advocates of the program; they had each indicated an interest in the program from the start and had voluntarily undertaken the additional responsibility required.

One question often raised is "What are the principles behind the bilingual education program?" There are basically two concepts of bilingual education prevalent in the district. The first is that the bilingual education program should facilitate the acceptance of the student into the dominant culture; the second view is that the program should help the student to function equally well in two cultures and two languages. Administrators generally accept the second concept, but many teachers do not. This is one of the major areas where the English as a Second Language (ESL) program differs from the bilingual education program.

Although both ESL and bilingual education are addressed to the needs of the student who speaks little or no English, the philosophies and goals of the programs are radically different. The ESL program seeks to transform the monolingual, non-English-speaking student into someone who is primarily an English speaker. ESL does not attempt to retain any student's ability in his or her native language; nor is there any attempt to capitalize on the subject matter or concepts the student has mastered in his native language.

In most instances, ESL students are confined to one room per grade level. A student may spend the entire school day in the ESL classroom or, as is often the case with junior and senior high school students, may be released to attend "non-academic" classes such as shop and physical education. Whether or not ESL is in a self-contained classroom, all instruction within the classroom is geared toward proficiency in English.

The educational objective of ESL is to help students be proficient enough in English to enter a regular classroom. This may be a sound educational objective, but often it happens that the student becomes functional in English, but is one year or more behind in all academic subjects. It would appear, then, that ESL sacrifices instruction in substantive academic areas for competency in English.

The bilingual program seeks to help dominant English- or Spanish-speaking students become functional in both English and Spanish. A conscious attempt is made to retain the non-English-speaking student's native language abilities; there is no attempt to sacrifice the student's knowledge in Spanish for proficiency in English. All lessons are taught concurrently in Spanish and English.

The Concurrent Approach: English and Spanish

The concurrent approach used in every classroom in the bilingual program is simply the simultaneous teaching of subject matter in both English and Spanish. For example, in an arithmetic counting lesson, each concept is taught in both languages with equal emphasis. This makes it possible for students dominant in either English or Spanish to comprehend the lesson fully; it also makes it possible for the student to hear the concept repeated and thus reinforced. For the English-dominant student, it provides the opportunity to either obtain or retain fluency in the Spanish language; for the Spanish-dominant child, it makes it possible to keep up and not fall behind in the academic work. For the monolingual student, the concurrent approach makes it possible to learn another language well.

The concurrent approach does not emphasize one language at the expense of another. Since this is the rule in all instruction, there is no negative or positive association with either language. Neither is the concurrent approach merely translation from one language to another. This method makes it essential that the teachers, aides, and others involved* in the learning process understand, speak, read, and write both languages. Without this ability, the program cannot work well.

An indication of the success of the concurrent method used in the bilingual program is the ability of the black students in the Title VII schools to speak Spanish. The Spanish-speaking ability of the black students is such that black students who have been involved in the program from kindergarten and are now in 4th grade are speaking Spanish without an accent and are reading and writing Spanish well. If the program were not bilingual but dominant English, this would be highly improbable. Some Asian children, by participating in the Title VII program, are now trilingual-English, Japanese or Chinese, and Spanish.

The concurrent approach to education does not necessarily provide the student with more information or substance than he or she would ordinarily get in a particular subject, but it does provide reinforcement for any concept that the student is learning.

---

*The term "others involved" covers such personnel as resource teachers, librarians, specialists, and student teachers. All student teachers in the bilingual program schools are required to be fluent in Spanish and English.

Bicultural Education

The bilingual program also attempts to provide a positive self-image for the student. To achieve this goal, a bicultural approach has been initiated as an integral part of the bilingual program. Not only are the successes of the Anglo-American emphasized, but also the successes and the history of Spanish-speaking people.

It appears, however, that this is one of the weaker aspects of the bilingual program. Although some teachers devote a great deal of time to the cultural and image aspects of the program, many teachers do not feel the need for the extensive and intensive work that is required to present this aspect of the program effectively. When this is the case, the bicultural component usually amounts to a superficial treatment of a holiday or a well-known cultural hero.[*]

Some Title VII teachers who believe in the bicultural approach have initiated special projects. One teacher created a film strip of Mexican history aimed at the American child of Mexican heritage. Others have searched out enrichment material that emphasizes the positive aspects of the heritage of the Spanish-speaking child. Parent volunteers have brought special cultural activities to the classroom.

While these activities are not atypical, they are not particularly representative of the daily routine in Title VII bilingual classrooms. Many of the more activist groups, including the Mexican-American Education Commission, have taken the position that until a comprehensive bicultural approach has been instituted in all classrooms, the bilingual program cannot be considered a success.

The questions concerning biculturalism have implications concerning the recruitment and selection of teachers for the bilingual program. There are two loosely structured groups with differing opinions on this subject. One group feels that the Chicano student does not need a role model of a Chicano teacher in order to do well in school. The most important consideration should not be the race or ethnic background of the teacher, but the teacher's skills, experience, and empathy to the Chicano student. This group, referred to as the "moderates" by some, has also advanced the opinion that it would be a tragic mistake to place only Chicanos or teachers of Mexican heritage in the schools in West Seaside. Some of the

---

[*] The holiday most often celebrated as an example of biculturalism is Cinco de Mayo. Emilio Zapata appears to be the popular favorite for cultural hero.

Chicano teachers, they indicate, have proved to be completely insensitive to the needs of the Spanish-speaking. Instead of establishing rapport with these children, the teachers appear to be repulsed by them, as if they reminded them of some negative part of their past.

The other group, referred to by some educational personnel as "activists," states that Spanish-speaking ability alone is insufficient to meet the needs of the Mexican-American children in Seaside. In order to completely understand these children, there must be a sensitivity not only to language difficulties, but to cultural differences as well. The activists maintain that the student must be able to identify with the teacher to establish the high degree of rapport necessary for reaching the often disillusioned Chicano student.

Fluency Committee

The disagreement over bicultural education is complicated by the existence of a Spanish proficiency examination. Whereas initially any teacher who expressed an interest in the bilingual program was automatically allowed to teach in the school because of the shortage of Spanish-speaking persons, the situation has changed drastically. The Bilingual Advisory Board successfully lobbied for a Fluency Committee for the Title VII program composed of (1) a community person, (2) a school person, and (3) a member of the Title VII staff (usually an evaluator or coordinator). The Fluency Committee now has districtwide cognizance, and is staffed on a rotating basis. Teachers interested in the bilingual program must first pass all board requirements and be certified as teachers. Then they must pass both a written and reading examination in Spanish. If the individual passes this examination and establishes oral competence before the Fluency Committee, then as soon as a position is available, the teacher is placed in one of the four schools.*

The test has proved to be extremely difficult for Chicanos and native Spanish-speaking applicants. Spanish had been looked upon with such disfavor in Seaside that, in order to "fit" into the system and achieve success, they had stopped speaking Spanish. Often these individuals have not spoken it for so long that they have lost the ability to do so. It is rather an ironic situation, for now that the system says it is acceptable, even desirable, to speak Spanish--that it is an asset--many formerly Spanish-speaking individuals who have gone through the system can no longer do so. Many Chicanos can understand Spanish but can no longer speak it, nor can they write or read Spanish.*

---

*Presently, approximately 50 percent of the teachers are classified as Mexican-Americans or Chicanos; the other 50 percent is composed of Spanish-speaking whites with a few Spanish-speaking blacks.

Whatever the reason, the perception of some informants was that a large percentage of the Chicano applicants who take the proficiency exam fail or are discouraged from taking the exam. This has resulted in community resentment and discussion about the need for new selection criteria. For those who envision a model of bicultural education based on an ethnic match between teacher and student, this situation is seen as an attempted subversion.

The official policy of the program is that teachers who learn of the program and are interested may take the proficiency exam. If the applicant passes the exam, he is placed when there is an opening in one of the schools.

There is no indication now as to how the question of what is adequate bicultural education will be resolved. It is certain, however, that it will continue to be a highly controversial issue in connection with Title VII in the Seaside school district.

The Impact of Bilingual Education Program on Teaching Methodology and Classroom Environment

The bilingual approach to education does not dictate any particular type of teaching methodology or style. There is sufficient flexibility in the bilingual program for a teacher who follows a traditional, authoritarian classroom model or for a teacher who follows an open, individualized instructional approach to feel comfortable. The bilingual approach has had diverse effects on classroom teaching styles. In some ways the bilingual program has caused classroom teaching to become more rigid and structured. In other instances, it has caused classroom teaching to become more individualized.

The bilingual program is structured in the sense that a concurrent approach in all subject matter is used by the teacher, the educational aide, or the student teacher (if one is present). The student reads Spanish for a prescribed amount of time. This set-up encourages a structured scheduling (see Annex to this section). Where team teaching is used, there also is a tendency to adhere to a rather strict schedule, so students will know when to change classes, move into groups, and change subject matter.

The bilingual program has, however, encouraged and made possible individualized and small-group instruction because of the additional classroom personnel.

---

*These individuals are not functional in "pure" Spanish or the Spanish ("Mexican") used in the barrios.

An essential part of the bilingual program consists of diagnostic and prescriptive tests and evaluation. These measures make it possible to examine individual student deficiencies or strengths, thereby allowing teachers and educational aides to work effectively to alleviate these problems. The result is a more individualized structure and more specific attention to the needs of the individual student. It would therefore be difficult to make a general statement as to whether the bilingual program has increased or decreased the amount of openness and individualization in the classroom. Perhaps more important is the effect of the bilingual program on the students in the classroom: Do they feel freer in the classroom? Do they feel better about themselves? Do they ask questions? Is there more interaction between students and between teachers and students? We believe that the answers to these questions are generally affirmative.

The classroom environment reflects the interests and needs of the students. The bulletin board displays are, for example, in both Spanish and English; books in both languages are available for the students; media equipment available for the students' use reinforces educational concepts in both English and Spanish.

Equipment in each classroom includes a filmstrip projector, a typewriter, a tape recorder, and a record player. There is often other equipment in the room, depending on the nature of the project on which the teacher and students are working. Equipment and curriculum materials are available from the resource center overseen by the school coordinator. The teachers or education aides may check out the project equipment and curriculum materials for individual classroom use. Administrative Area Y headquarters has an extensive curriculum center. Any teacher participating in the bilingual program or any of the school coordinators may check out materials from this center. The center provides a curriculum consultant to help teachers in Area Y. The curriculum consultant also conducts formal, in-service training sessions.

The success of the bilingual program is commonly attributed to the amount of in-service training conducted. In-service training amounts to practical lessons for the teachers for implementing certain educational techniques. Teachers are also shown how to achieve some of the goals of the program.

Regardless of the dominant philosophy at any of the four project schools, there are certain things which Title VII funds do not affect. Title VII funds do not pay teachers' salaries; their salaries are paid through the district. Title VII pays for teaching staff pretraining and in-service training. Pretraining is the orientation that takes place before actual classroom teaching; in-service training takes place throughout the school year. Title VII also pays for materials and supplies necessary to operate the program--curriculum materials, books, readers, anthologies, tape recorders, record players, film projectors, slide projectors, records, musical instruments, etc. This list is not exhaustive, but it indicates the type of materials and supplies that are provided through Title VII funds. One of the most essential services that Title VII supports is the provision of educational aides for every classroom in the bilingual program.

MECHANICS OF THE PROGRAM

The program's functions in the four public schools and one parochial school are coordinated through the efforts of several staff persons. The project director is responsible for the overall operation of the bilingual program. In each public school there is a bilingual project coordinator, one of whom is also coordinator for the parochial school. The coordinator in each case has taught in the bilingual program but does not now teach any classes.

The coordinators function as resource persons. Their primary responsibility, as the title implies, is to coordinate the activities of the bilingual program in the assigned schools. These duties include conducting tours for visitors, maintaining a resource center, conducting in-service and pre-service training for teachers, and filling out the required evaluation forms for the bilingual program. Each coordinator is assisted by a full-time bilingual clerk. Other full-time staff persons associated with the bilingual program are a curriculum consultant and an evaluator. Two secretaries comprise the support staff of the program.

The superintendent of Area Y has the ultimate responsibility for any education program in the administrative area, including the Title VII project.

In its downtown headquarters the Seaside district maintains a bilingual office which loosely coordinates the activities of all bilingual programs in the district. In addition to the Title VII program in Area Y, there is another Title VII program in the district, which has little contact with the Area Y program.

Teacher Selection

When the bilingual program was initiated, the district did not maintain a list of teachers with fluency in Spanish. To further complicate the problem of locating qualified teachers, the funding was not received until the beginning of September--just weeks before the start of the 1970 school year.

The actual selection process took place during the week before school started. Any teachers in the four schools who indicated on their personnel forms an ability to speak Spanish were contacted and asked if they wanted to voluntarily participate in a bilingual program. This recruitment resulted in a staff with a wide range of ability levels. Since all the teachers had volunteered for the program, the level of enthusiasm was quite high; however, the abilities ranged from those who had taken a couple of Spanish classes in school to those who were native speakers.

During the second year of the project, several things were done to raise the ability level of the teachers. A ruling by the school board permitted teachers to transfer from one area to another without the usual process if they had a particularly useful skill. This allowed bilingual teachers to be transferred into the bilingual program schools from anywhere throughout the district.

The other procedure implemented was the establishment of the Fluency Committee. The Fluency Committee screens all teachers before they are referred to a Title VII school for interview.

Education Aides

Education aides for the bilingual program must reside in the respective school attendance area. There is also a screening process for education aides. They must be able to read, write, and speak Spanish, and must pass a proficiency test in that language; they are also expected to be literate in English.

These aides are classified as educational aides III; the Seaside City School District reserves this designation for aides who work directly with students. They are not hired to run stencils or dittos, or perform housekeeping duties in the classroom. Their primary responsibility is to assist students in small groups and in individualized instruction. These full-time classroom aides are an essential component of the program because the teachers could not utilize the concurrent approach in the bilingual education program and do the necessary preparation and evaluation without an additional full-time person in the classroom.

Nonstaff

In order to assure continuity of the bilingual program, persons assisting in any of the project schools, such as student teachers, are expected to be bilingual.

The proximity of the state university at Seaside assures the presence of student teachers in all of the project schools. Most student teachers must demonstrate fluency in both English and Spanish before they are placed. There are no requirements for parent volunteers. Because of the availability of student teachers and parent volunteers, there is often a high ratio of adults to students in the bilingual classrooms. It is not uncommon to walk into a classroom and find a teacher, an education aide, and a student teacher all working closely with small groups of children.

Reading Program

Under the bilingual program, each of the schools has been able to maintain its individuality. At one school, for example, in conjunction with the English-reading time for the 2nd and 3rd grades, the school has contracted with a private firm for a reading achievement center. Called "the reading game," this is an eclectic approach, employing materials and equipment that reflect the needs of the school. The private firm provides desks, chairs, and all furniture, paints the room, and installs all the equipment for the reading laboratory. The children are expected to become increasingly independent and work at their own speed. There are evaluative materials in which the teacher may check the progress of the children from day to day. The students' response has been uniformly positive. The children are enjoying reading--and are enthusiastic about their reading time. For the Spanish-speaking students, the laboratory time is used for drill in ESL, as they are not yet ready to use the laboratory equipment. They work in small groups or under individualized instruction, either in the reading center or in the classroom, with an educational aide or a teacher.

The reading center has two central directors, a graduate student "guide," the classroom teacher, an educational aide, and a student teacher; with two classes it is probable that there will be ten or more adults in the center. On occasion there are as many as 16 adults, depending upon the number of guides from the state university. In many cases this provides a student-teacher ratio of 2 to 1 or at most 4 to 1.

Another school has combined grades so that the classrooms consist of two grade levels each--1st and 2nd, 3rd and 4th, and 5th and 6th. This is because of the reading program that has been instituted at this particular school. This school also has a double session in kindergarten. Both teacher and aide help during the reading period, providing the services of four adults for 26 or 27 students. For example, the afternoon kindergarten teacher comes in early and is in the classroom during the morning reading period. The morning kindergarten teacher and aide stay late so that they are in the classroom during the afternoon kindergarten session. This has made it possible to reach virtually every child in the kindergarten at the school to meet the child's reading needs, and all of the children now are at the point where they are doing decoding if not reading.

Evaluation

The coordinators oversee all testing and evaluation in the project schools. The data they collect from the individual classroom teacher are then sent to the in-house bilingual evaluator in the district's evaluation office.

At a weekly coordinators' meeting we attended, the main topic of conversation was the testing and evaluation of students. There was a minor revolt among coordinators, on behalf of the teachers, concerning administering the same self-concept test that has been used for the three previous years. Administering the test this year would be the fourth time it had been used for students who are now in the fourth grade. The coordinators said that the test has ceased to be an accurate measure of any gains as a result of the bilingual program; instead, it merely tests the attitudes toward that particular testing instrument. The consensus is that the students have memorized the test, and when they see the pictures (used as the basis for questions), they know what the questions are going to be. This minor revolt indicates some of the difficulties encountered by the in-house evaluator, since the in-house evaluator is under the direction of the assistant director of the district's research and evaluation branch, who, for example, has insisted on continuing the self-concept tests in order to maintain the longitudinal design of self-concept observations.

POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT

Many individuals involved with the school district see the establishment of the Title VII Bilingual Education Program as the result of the political activism of the late 1960s. Whether this is true or not, the activities of Chicano activists did, to some extent, shape the local operation of the bilingual program.

The Title VII Parent Advisory Council was established to encourage community input into the decisionmaking structure. Although this ability has not always been used to the fullest, the heightened political awareness of the Spanish-speaking community as a direct result of the West Seaside walkouts* has made district personnel more sensitive to requests from the community.

---

*The walkouts occurred in the West Seaside community in the late 1960s. Students walked out of classes, parents and community members picketed, and demands for relevant curriculum and good teachers in the barrio were made to the school board. There were a number of arrests, and several teachers received disciplinary action for their stand with the community.

Several organized community groups have maintained an interest in the Title VII program. Perhaps the most outspoken one is the Mexican-American School Commission, which is sponsored by the school board.*

The primary concerns of the Mexican-American School Commission have been (1) to improve the conditions in those schools that service Spanish-speaking neighborhoods; (2) to increase the number of Spanish-speaking certificated, classified, and administrative personnel; and (3) to promote bilingual, bicultural models of education. The success of the commission in effecting change in these areas has been limited.

The commission believes that the district's Title VII program is not good enough as a model of either bilingual or bicultural education. In their opinion, the district's failure to commit any substantial amount of district funds to either a bilingual or bicultural program shows that the district lacks commitment.

The commission and other politically active Chicano groups attribute this lack of responsiveness to the fact that the Chicanos have only one vote on the school board. Whether this view is accurate or not, many West Seaside residents are trying to incorporate the neighborhood as a separate municipality. They feel that the best interests of the Mexican-American community, heavily concentrated in West Seaside, cannot be well represented by the present governing structures.

There are several hundred schools in the Seaside school district. Approximately 25 percent of the students are Mexican-American and 25 percent are black. Of the certificated teaching positions, 3 percent are Mexican-American and 9 to 10 percent are black. Thus the minority student population accounts for more than half of the students in the district.

The Seaside district has never supported a bilingual or bicultural program through district funds, although several programs have been implemented in the district with federal and state funds. The district did not pass a statement of support for bilingual education until 1973.

In addition to the Title VII funds, a Title I-based, limited state-funded program is directed toward bilingual education; 75 percent of the certificated teachers in this program are not bilingual. To compensate for this difficulty, bilingual aides are extensively used in the classroom.

The district's Title VII project, operating since 1970, has one more year (1974-75) of funding. The district administration has not indicated whether district funds will be available for continuation or dissemination of the program. With the completion of the Title VII program, however, all teachers in the four schools will be bilingual. In addition, much of the curriculum materials in these schools will be new and directly relevant to a bilingual education program.

---

*The other two groups are the Black School Commission and the Asian School Commission, which partially resulted from demands on the school board by activists during the political upheavals of the 1960s.

The Area Y superintendent has supported the Title VII program. There has, however, been no indication of plans for dissemination of the program beyond the schools already involved.

SUMMARY COMMENTS

The data collected so far are insufficient to support any definite conclusions. There is, however, enough information to warrant some summary comments and observations.

The dedication and quality of the teachers involved in the bilingual programs are apparent to any casual classroom observer. They like education and like children. All of this is reflected in the attitude of the students toward school, and the happiness that permeates Title VII classrooms. School classrooms have so often been described as joyless places, but these Title VII schools are not typical of those found in the barrios or ghettos. This type of attitude and atmosphere is not accidental. The bilingual program has sensitized teachers and made them more aware of the needs of the children who live in the area where they are teaching.

The principals of the four participating schools appear to be pleased with the program. They say that the program means extra work--community meetings, preparing teachers, public relations work. However, the school coordinator reduced the principal's responsibility for evaluation paperwork, so that the principal handles virtually none of the paperwork associated with the program. This is a very positive factor, allowing the principal to get more involved with community activities and avoid the paperwork that accompanies so many federal programs.

The community initially disapproved of the bilingual concept. The parents too were products of the system that equated Spanish with something negative. They were very concerned that the teaching of Spanish in the schools would mean that their children would not learn enough English to function in the society. After explanations from principals, teachers, and some Title VII staff, parents were reassured that nothing would be lost as a result of the Title VII program, but instead there would be a positive gain. The program has been so widely acclaimed that now Chicano parents are having their children attend one of the four Title schools on special permit, as have some black parents who want their children to be bilingual and see the project as an opportunity to attain this.

As a result of the bilingual program, all four district schools have become better education facilities. There is more parent involvement, more rapport between education personnel and the community, the children are happier and their needs are being better met, and teachers are certainly more dedicated. Non-academic services like cafeteria service have also improved.

In one school, even the method of handling educationally handicapped students has been bolstered as a result of the bilingual program. Now students formerly designated as educationally handicapped because of low test scores can be accurately diagnosed as either having educational problems or simply as not knowing enough English to do well on the tests. Before the bilingual program, neither instruments nor personnel were available to determine whether in fact the child was truly educationally handicapped or was just having a language problem. The teacher for educationally handicapped students is also bilingual.

As a further indication of a better community attitude toward the school, the vandalism rate in all four schools has been reduced. There is a constant stream of visitors in and out of the bilingual classrooms--another indication of the program's success. Whereas before, because of certain attitudes of the educational staff, parents did not feel welcome in the schools, now the schools are open for visits by any parent or other interested person. Some school districts have tried to adopt the program in toto; other districts or schools have adopted elements of the program; but everyone reviewing the program feels that it is of positive benefit for the non-English-speaking student.

One of the most difficult concepts for teachers and administrators visiting the program remains the implementation of instruction that is bicultural as well as bilingual. The idea of a concurrent approach with equal emphasis on both Spanish and English is difficult for many educators to accept. Spanish and other non-English languages were taboo in the classroom for so long that it is difficult now for many educators to accept other languages as having equal worth. Visiting teachers are also often concerned with the noise level and discipline in the classrooms. The children in the school are certainly no less disciplined than children are elsewhere--in fact, they are probably more disciplined because they are learning in a noncoercive atmosphere. They are, however, learning to be self-directed and independent, and the noise level varies in the classroom, depending on what work students are doing at any particular time. The bilingual approach does not in any manner dictate whether a classroom will be more or less noisy. It does dictate, however, that the teaching will be child-centered.

Next year the Title VII bilingual program will expand to formally include 5th and 6th grades, and it will be the last year of funding under Title VII. Although the program is considered a success by the administration, principals, teachers, parents, and by the students involved, it is unlikely to be continued at its present level after 1974-75. Title VII has limited provisions for continuation of a temporary program, nor is it likely that the present level of funding will be available through other federal or state sources.

Some aspects of the program, however, will undoubtedly be continued. There will be more concern for the Spanish-speaking child because of the interest and dedication of the teachers in these four bilingual project schools. Parents have learned aspects of local school operations; they have become familiar with the education bureaucracy. The skills and techniques that have been devised for dealing with this bureaucracy may carry over to other types of programs and aid in making the schools more responsive to the needs of the Spanish-speaking student.

Annex

SUGGESTED SCHEDULES FOR SEASIDE FEDERAL TITLE VII PROGRAM

THREE-HOUR KINDERGARTEN SCHEDULE

9:00 - 9:20	Room business
9:20 - 9:40	Teacher-directed reading (group or individual)
9:40 - 10:00	Group activities (two teachers directing group) - viewing, listening, handwriting, spelling (help of aide) - follow-up - manipulative activities - exploratory activities (math, science) - art (illustrations for stories, charts) - library browsing - learning games - individual writing, typewriter - speaking and recording center, dictate or tell stories into tape recorder - second language (aide); SSL if directed reading is in Spanish; ESL if directed reading is in English
10:00 - 10:20	Recess
10:20 - 10:40	Math instruction
10:40 - 11:00	Other reading period
11:00 - 11:20	Other reading period
11:20 - 11:40	Peabody, Magic Circle, A.A.A.S.
11:40 - 12:00	Music, P.E., rhythms

DIVIDED DAY KINDERGARTEN

8:30 - 8:45	Language activities - stories - puppets - poems - etc. (with children on hand)
8:45 - 9:30	One-fourth of class reading English; one-fourth reading Spanish. (Teacher directs lesson and individual activities.)
9:30 - 9:45	Room business
9:45 - 10:00	Magic Circle or A.A.A.S.
10:00 - 10:20	Recess
10:20 - 10:40	Math instruction
10:40 - 11:00	Music, P.E., Rhythms
11:00 - 11:15	One-half of class use Peabody; one-half SSL (aide)
11:15 - 11:30	One-half of class use Peabody; one-half ESL (aide)
11:30 - 11:40	Dismissal and transition
11:40 - 12:25	Second reading period
12:25 - 12:30	Dismissal

FIRST AND SECOND GRADES

Regular Day (9:00 - 2:00) Bilingual Teacher

9:00 - 9:10	Room business
9:10 - 9:55	Reading and related activities
9:55 - 10:00	Recess organization
10:00 - 10:20	Recess
10:20 - 11:00	Math (2-3 groups)
11:00 - 11:55	Reading in other language
11:55 - 12:00	Organization for lunch

Regular Day (9:00 - 2:00) Bilingual Teacher

12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 1:30	Oral language
	- Peabody
	- A.A.A.S.
	- Magic Circle
	- Language enrichment
1:30 - 1:55	P.E., Rhythms, Music
1:55 - 2:00	Evaluation and dismissal

FIRST AND SECOND GRADES

Divided Day (9:00 - 3:00) Bilingual Teacher

9:00 - 9:55	Reading in Spanish
9:55 - 10:00	Recess organization
10:00 - 10:20	Recess
10:20 - 11:00	Math
11:00 - 11:55	Reading (English)
11:55 - 12:00	Lunch organization
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 1:30	Oral language
	- Peabody
	- A.A.A.S.
	- Magic Circle
1:30 - 2:00	P.E., Rhythms, Music
2:00 - 3:00	Reading (Spanish)

SECOND GRADE TEAM TEACHING

9:00 - 9:10	Room business
9:10 - 10:00	Reading (each teacher teaches own class)
	- Bilingual in Spanish
	- Monolingual in English
10:00 - 10:20	A.A.A.S. or Magic Circle
10:20 - 10:40	Recess
10:40 - 11:00	Math
11:00 - 11:20	Peabody (oral language)
11:20 - 11:40	P.E., Music, Rhythms
11:40 - 12:00	Magic Circle or A.A.A.S.
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 1:50	Reading (teachers meet each other's children and take them to their room for reading)
1:50 - 2:10	Reading groups return to room for evaluation and dismissal

SECOND GRADE TEAM TEACHING

Divided Day (9:00 - 3:00)

9:00 - 9:50	Reading (each teacher teaches own class)
	- Bilingual in Spanish
	- Monolingual in English
9:50 - 10:00	Recess organization
10:00 - 10:20	Recess
10:20 - 10:30	Room business
10:30 - 11:00	Math
11:10 - 11:30	Peabody (oral language)
11:30 - 11:50	P.E., Music, Rhythms
11:50 - 12:00	Ready for lunch
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch

Divided Day (9:00 - 3:00)

1:00 - 1:50	Teachers switch classes for reading
1:50 - 2:00	Return to rooms for evaluation and dismissal
2:00 - 2:50	Reading (same as 9:00 a.m.)
2:50 - 3:00	Dismissal

SUGGESTED DAILY SCHEDULE FOR THIRD GRADE

9:00 - 9:10	Room business
9:10 - 9:55	Reading in Spanish
	- Beginning decoding
	- SSL
	- Spelling
	- Creative writing/handwriting
	- Reading
	- Independent/reinforcement
10:00 - 10:20	Recess
10:20 - 11:00	Concurrent math
11:00 - 12:00	Oral language
	- Peabody
	- Triple AAA science
	- Language enrichment (cultural heritage)
	- Magic Circle
	- Enrichment centers
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 2:00	Reading
2:00 - 3:00	Art - once a week
	- P.E./rhythms (total 60 min. weekly)
	- Social studies (safety, health ed., career ed., music)--4-day week

GRAND FORK

Gerald C. Sumner and Gail Zellman

The combined site time for fieldworkers was three and one-half days. There were seven primary informants:

> The project director, a Chicano who holds a Ph. D. in Political Science, has taught college, but never before worked in a public school district (career-bound).
>
> The former project director, a young midwestern latino who succeeded in developing bilingual education in Grand Fork beyond the previous ESL efforts. He wrote the Title VII proposal, but quit in the middle of the first year of funding to pursue a Ph. D. (career-bound).
>
> The bilingual consultant, who, according to the project director, functions as the "brains" of the bilingual program. The district's first ESL teacher, she has remained the primary intellectual source on ESL as the ESL program developed into the present bilingual program. Her present primary function is administering the program's mobile learning unit (place-bound).
>
> The Taylor School principal, who largely runs the bilingual program in his junior high, since the focus of the district is on the elementary component (place-bound).
>
> The Bilingual Advisory Council members, who represent the more conservative faction among Grand Fork latinos. They founded the Latin American Council but were later disenfranchised by a more liberal and militant faction. Together, they are planning to develop the Bilingual Advisory Council into a more powerful organization. They characterize their roles as instigators who get something started, then pass the torch to others to carry on (place-bound).
>
> The Latin American Council member, who is a member of the liberal faction that took over the council (place-bound).

We also interviewed five district officers, one elementary principal, two project teachers, and one regular teacher. Classroom observation was conducted at three schools.

THE LEA

Grand Fork is a city of approximately 150, 000 in a midwestern state. It is a manufacturing center, principally business machinery, auto parts, chemicals, and paper products. There are about 30, 000 public school students and 11, 000 non-public school students. The public school district has more than 50 elementary schools, 5 middle schools, 4 junior highs, and 4 high schools.

The community is 88 percent white, 11.3 percent black, and 0.7 percent other, mainly Spanish-speaking people and Indians. There are relatively more latino children in the schools than in the population. One and one-half percent of all public senior high school students in 1973-74 were latino. The percentage increases to 2.5 percent for the junior high and middle schools, and 3.7 percent for the elementary schools. Only 2 percent of the teachers in the Grand Fork district are latino.

The latino population in Grand Fork includes Cubans, Dominicans, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans. These people came to Grand Fork by a number of routes. About 1967-68 a local Protestant church sponsored a large number of Cuban families for citizenship. The church helped them find employment and also took the children from these families into the church schools. But eventually most of the children, who were Catholic, left the church school in favor of the public schools. More recently, when it became difficult for Cubans to come to the United States, a number went to Spain, stayed there for awhile, and then came to Grand Fork. Mexican-Americans came to Grand Fork through the migrant stream, dropping out in the last three years and settling down because of the available jobs. Puerto Ricans were also drawn by available jobs. No one we talked to seemed to know how or why the Dominicans arrived.

This heterogeneous population presents a number of problems in bilingual education. For example, many of the colloquialisms used in Spanish vary from subgroup to subgroup. An incident was recounted where a word in Mexican-American Spanish which was entirely acceptable was a very obscene word to Cuban children.

The district enjoys a large array of special projects, with many varieties of funding source as well as classroom intervention. The assistant superintendent for instruction attributes much of this innovative spirit to the experience in the late sixties, when the district adopted compensatory education on a large scale. He was director of compensatory education at that time and says that it catalyzed major change in the district during the late sixties. A little later they got into performance contracting, which was a natural follow-through.

A more recent catalyst for change was the advent of a new superintendent who had instructions to shuffle the organization, particularly at the top levels. At middle management levels, there was less head-rolling and more reassignment. He has taken district staff out of private offices and placed them in one large room where individual office spaces are circumscribed by easily removable modular partitions. Partitions vary from shoulder to ceiling height, depending on the importance of the occupant. Office spaces are laid out in a very irregular pattern, and secretaries set up their desks in the passageways between office spaces. The feeling is modern-day Hobbiton.

According to a member of the Bilingual Advisory Council, one of the superintendent's greatest contributions was that he changed the complexion of the district with respect to finding politically acceptable solutions to problems. He brought a new deputy superintendent, and both of them, unlike their predecessors, are very willing to listen. Also, in the last few years the board of education has changed membership, and is much more liberal than its predecessors.

CURRENT PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

Grand Fork's Bilingual Bicultural Project includes resident programs in one elementary school (Werner) and one junior high (Taylor). There is also a mobile resource unit that runs a scheduled circuit of other elementary schools. A total of 485 students are served by the whole program. There are 20 teachers, 11 teaching aides, 2 administrators, and 3 staff.

The project completed its second year of Title VII funding in the spring of 1974. Title VII funding 1973-74 amounted to $93,000, about one-quarter of the total cost. The remainder was paid from Title I, state, and local funding.

Werner School

Forty-four percent of the student population at Werner are latinos, and the principal complains of a 55 percent annual turnover rate among students. Latinos are bused in from other attendance areas to participate in the bilingual program. At present, the school has 125 students over capacity.

Grades K-4, amounting to more than 200 students, are served by the bilingual program. The classrooms are self-contained; most instruction is handled by the homeroom teacher. There is a pullout room for kids who need ESL or who have remedial problems. Some of the grades use team teaching, and rely very little on the pullout room. There is also a Spanish teacher who moves around to all of the classrooms in the school teaching SSL. The operation of the pullout room seems very flexible, which is probably necessary because of the wide range of student needs.

Taylor School

Taylor's student population contains significant proportions of Anglos, latinos, and blacks. The principal boasts he has never had a racial problem involving the latinos; the white kids accept the latinos, and the black kids are wary of the latinos' reputation as willing fighters. The principal runs a tight program: no study hours are allowed, classes are scheduled for each hour of the school day, and activities keep kids busy after school.

The bilingual program at Taylor is combined with compensatory reading and math. Participation is mandatory, but students are allowed to change if they test less than 1. 8 years below grade level. . Toward the end of the 1973-74 school year, there were 105 participants.

The program relies on materials purchased from a specialized commercial supplier for reading and math. These materials are individualized and premised upon contingency management, so there is no lecturing. Instructions are provided to students individually, and Anglos generally get their instructions in English.

Participants are scheduled in the program for a three-hour block, with one hour each devoted to math, reading, and ESL. Some cross-cultural exposure is incorporated during ESL, but it is not of the crepe paper variety, consisting mainly of discussions of heroes and special events. There is no SSL other than the school's regular Spanish class.

There are two teachers and four teaching aides. The aides accompany Spanish-dominant kids to regular classrooms to tutor and interpret.

Mobile Unit

The bilingual bus is a mobile learning center that the bilingual consultant and her latino teacher aide take to the number of elementary schools in the district that have no bilingual program but need some sort of bilingual education for their students. It is equipped with audiovisual facilities, desks, and materials.

The Peabody test is used to screen younger participants. For older children the bilingual consultant uses a regular IQ test and looks for discrepancies between reading and math scores.

INITIATION

In the school year 1962-63, a group of the key principals in Grand Fork prepared a report on the status of education there. They concluded, among other things, that elementary education in Grand Fork was much too standardized and did not take into account the cultural differences of the students in the different schools. In regard to Werner School in particular, they said that in the light of immigration patterns there was a clear need for English as a second language curriculum. There was no action on this recommendation for several years.

Werner School

A few years ago the district used Title I money to hire a woman to teach a class that was comprised of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd graders. Because of her expertise in ESL, children with language problems in Werner were sent to her class. Werner is located in Grand Fork's barrio, and at the time she began to teach, about 30 percent of the students were latino. At that time very few spoke only Spanish, but there were a large number whose English was very limited.

In 1970-71, the district used more Title I money to place a noncertified latino at Werner to serve as an aide and consultant. He ran a bilingual component on a daily pullout basis for grades K-3. This hiring may have been a token gesture, because he was apparently not qualified to do the job that he was hired to do. However, he awakened the latino community to the need for special programs for their children, especially with the rapid increase in the latino population at that time. As a result, community pressure on the board of education increased, and finally the superintendent created an advisory council and hired a bilingual coordinator to begin in August 1971.

Up to the point when he was hired, the operative force for bilingual education at the district staff level was the federal program manager, who had long had an independent interest in education for the Spanish-dominant student population.

The bilingual coordinator's success at district level also had community impact. An advisory council member characterized him as a Pied Piper. Whereas latino kids and adults had tended to be introverted before, because of cultural differences, the coordinator was able to bring them out to the point where they became involved in community and particularly in school affairs. "Traditionally, parents had been excluded from school activities, especially the non-English-speaking parents." The coordinator spurred the parents' interest, possibly because he was a latino who held entree at all levels in the school organization, from classroom to the superintendent. Former teachers had had the same qualities, but they had been just teachers and had not seemed to have any impact at higher administrative levels.

In the 1971-72 school year, the coordinator spent a great deal of time looking at curriculum materials and evaluating their relevance to the various latino segments of the population. At this time there were two bilingual teachers and two paraprofessionals, with approximately 50 children in each bilingual class. This program was centered at Werner and was transition-oriented. The coordinator wanted to turn Werner into a resource center for bilingual education. The program provided free busing to and from Werner, from the child's house rather than from a bus stop down the street. He felt this was very important because latino parents are often very protective of their children. The program provided the children with free breakfast and lunch, and offered more individualized instruction than they could get in their regular classes. The staff also visited parents at home to help them understand what bilingual education was about.

The program at that time required parental consent in order for the children to participate. There was some opposition among parents to the bilingual program. They did not want to have their children waste valuable educational time learning Spanish.

The bilingual coordinator was also involved with preschoolers. He applied for some funds and began what he called a "Saturday program," which involved about 25 Anglo and latino children. The program went on for about fifty Saturdays and utilized high school students as volunteers. The children went on field trips and participated in a number of athletic programs around the community.

Part of his job was to look for and apply for funds to support bilingual education. About this time, the district "got vibrations" that for the first time the Title VII office in Washington was interested in funding projects outside the West, Southwest, and East.

From December 1971 to February 1972, the coordinator wrote a Title VII proposal, and for the 1972-73 school year, OE granted $75,000 under Title VII. This money allowed the program to hire more staff and offer more training. Some teachers were sent to a nearby city to work at the Spanish Language Development Center, learning about new curriculum materials and how to adapt them effectively to a bilingual program. These teachers returned to Grand Fork and served as facilitators for the other teachers.

Taylor School

The history of bilingualism at Taylor Junior High was somewhat independent from that of Werner Elementary. The focus of district staff efforts had been on early elementary grades, so at Taylor (whose attendance area encompassed that of Werner) the responsibility for meeting needs of Spanish-dominant students had to be at the building level. Taylor School first had any sort of bilingual program in 1971, when all of the Spanish-speaking kids were American-born latinos, and the regular program was able to handle them. The teachers simply published their own Spanish materials by adapting and translating materials from a reading and math program purchased from a private firm. They also hired local latino aides to come in and help with the math and reading program. In 1972, they hired a Spanish teacher, a latino, who also dealt with discipline problems and helped to socialize the students.

In the 1972-73 school year there was an influx of transient families from Cuba, Costa Rica, and Puerto Rico. This presented severe problems in developing communication skills and in general academic preparation. The principal's efforts for 1973-74 focused on bringing in personnel to handle these students. He was able to structure his program to qualify as an add-on to Werner School's second-year Title VII funding. This structure will be described in a later section.

IMPLEMENTATION

Instructional Model

At the beginning of the Title VII funding, in the fall of 1972, the program was limited to Werner School, grades K-3. SSL was taught in the program, as was ESL. During that school year, a 7th grade class in bilingual education was included at Werner because it was clear to many people that students leaving Werner were largely unprepared to deal with junior high because they had not learned enough English.

In December of that year, the coordinator quit to accept another job. The new coordinator was hired on the recommendation of the Latin American Council.

In the spring of that year, the bilingual consultant was assigned to commandeer an old bus that had belonged to reading services and that was no longer in use. Federal funds provided her with about $5000 for aides, and the district provided money to remodel the bus to be used as a traveling bilingual classroom. She got this program under way in time for the 1973-74 school year.

Four weeks before the start of school in the fall of 1973, the bilingual program's star teachers were given full scholarships to pursue Ph.D.s at the state university. As a result, the project director had to reduce the use of team teaching (pairing one bilingual teacher with one monolingual English teacher); a new itinerant SSL teacher was hired to help fill the gap. In some respects, this may have been an advantage because new test results have indicated that the Anglo kids are suddenly learning Spanish.

Taylor Junior High

At the beginning of the 1973-74 school year, Taylor Middle School became part of the Title VII project. They hired an additional latino teacher to help with discipline and social problems. The new teacher, hired in 1973, was from the Southwest, and it was felt that he would be closer in heritage to at least the American-born latinos. In addition to these two teachers, they hired three aides to assist kids into regular program classes; previously it was not uncommon for Spanish-speaking kids to spend no more than two hours per day in school, in math and in reading.

At first there was some stigma attached to participating in the bilingual project in the junior high school. The project required that participants not follow the same schedule as the other children. After a number of complaints from students, the project was restructured so that bilingual students followed the same schedule as other students and simply went to bilingual classes.

Under the new program each kid who was in the bilingual project had his day divided into one 3-hour block, the bilingual component, plus three hours in regular classrooms. The principal said that the three-hour block for bilingual work was necessary to tie into the bilingual project. The project director carefully pointed out that the "Title VII" project is actually funded by a mixture of Title VII, local, and Title I money, and that the Taylor portion is allocated from the latter source.

Although on the surface the bilingual program at Taylor appears to be integrated, in fact it probably is not for two reasons. First, the material they deal with for the math, science, and reading is all part of the commercial firm's individualized instruction program, which means that instead of communicating to the entire class at once, the teacher communicates individually to each student. Generally, when he talks to Anglo students, it is always in English. He may speak Spanish or English to latino students. Second, the Alpha program also serves as a school's remedial education program, and has for several years. In particular, at the beginning of the school year there were about 210 kids in the program, a large share of whom were Anglo kids. But the rule was that everyone who reached an achievement level of not less than 1.8 years below his grade level by the end of the first semester could leave the bilingual program and go on the regular classroom schedule for the full day. Most of those who so qualified were Anglos. At year's end, there were mostly latinos in the bilingual program.

Materials

The project director reported he is not happy with commercially available classroom materials because of the peculiar mix of his target group. He says that the materials he receives that are published overseas are good basically, but even these must be adapted. Interestingly, the bilingual coordinator at Werner, who is Anglo, claimed that they have been very successful in finding appropriate material from commercial sources. They rely heavily on the Miami Reading Program. They also have different kinds of teaching machines that can easily be programmed to their particular needs. Teachers at the school took part in the San Diego Materials Acquisition Program and found that very helpful also.

Community

Many Spanish-language parents objected originally to the Werner School program because the kids were segregated. Now, after two years, according to an advisory council member, parents lobby to get their kids included. A few parents have not allowed their kids to participate.

Advisory Council

At present the Bilingual Advisory Council consists of 19 persons, all latinos. These include parents, teachers (including regular program teachers), aides, and persons from the community. People outside of the attendance area served by the project are not excluded. According to the chairman, they are now trying to expand the council to include Anglos and blacks. They are also considering the possibility of expanding the bilingual program to include similar services for Dutch and Polish populations in the city. She says that the Dutch and Polish cultures are strong enough (these languages are used in church services) that there might be an appropriate role for at least a bicultural program for these populations within the school system.

An advisory council member said they intend to get people on the council who are established socially and financially in the community, because he feels they have access to power and to money and that they are the most effective salesmen for a program like the bilingual program, which requires such drastic change in the way people think about education. It also sounds as if they are building a power group to countervail the Latin American Council, the group that they had just led.

He was confident of the school board's support of the advisory council, and noted that the board sends council members to bilingual workshops and Title VII regional conferences. He asserted strongly that the council is effective.

The bilingual consultant was slightly less positive about the council. She said that they have a great deal of trouble getting parents to come to meetings. She attributed their lack of participation largely to structural problems. Most meetings are held in the afternoon so that fathers cannot possibly participate. Mothers with younger children have baby-sitting problems, and because so many of their children are bused they do have transportation problems in getting to the meetings. The parents who serve on the advisory council were selected by teachers because of their enthusiasm and interest in the project, but under the council's pending reorganization, existing members will determine future membership.

Latin American Council

In 1971 the Latin American Council was evolving from a drop-in center to something more in the line of community service. This change was facilitated by Model Cities funds that allowed the council to hire a few permanent staff members. At this time, latinos with a liberal bent (i.e., those preferring confrontation politics) took the leadership away from the conservative founders. The latter group included two members who presently head up the Bilingual Advisory Council. The conservatives, mostly established residents, have tried and failed to regain control.

The LAC characterizes itself as a referral agency, but it actually is a more positive action group. They involve themselves in voter registration, urban survival services for new immigrants, etc.

They operate an alternative education program. This is a school-type operation run from a church in downtown Grand Fork that tries to get dropouts back to school. Our LAC informant said that the Latin American Council has lately gotten results from the school system. He says that the Latin American Council is responsible for getting a latino principal in 1974-75, but he admitted that has taken four years to achieve.

The project director confirmed that he can always go to the Latin American Council for support for whatever kinds of educational programs he thinks are important for latino children. From our observations, it appears that his preferred contact with the community is the LAC (which is action-oriented) rather than the Bilingual Advisory Council (which is more deliberative).

Staff

The former project director is generally credited with making bilingual education in Grand Fork work. He was charismatic, macho, played basketball with the kids, zipped around on his motorcycle, was the target of set-ups with district officers' young sisters, and was generally the most eligible young bachelor around. He also had rapid entree to the superintendent through his childhood friend, now deputy superintendent. This was not lost on the Spanish-dominant community, and new community awareness was kindled in rapid time.

He kept his distance from the community and all activities not precisely having to do with education. For example, he describes his role in regard to the Latin American Council as that of staying on the fringe. He felt that he could best serve the community by not becoming heavily involved with the LAC. Rather, he wanted to serve as some sort of liaison between the LAC and the district. While he was concerned about affirmative action and relevancy, he felt that he was really oriented toward bilingual education. He did not choose to get involved in these other aspects except to lend some support to them from time to time. He made it quite clear that he saw himself as a school person and not as a representative of the community. He felt that he could best serve the community that way.

He said he felt that he had been well liked in the community, but came around to admitting that in some ways he was not very well accepted. He described this as largely a demographic problem. He is a midwestern latino, and he said that in the Midwest to be a real latino one must come from the Southwest. He is also rather Anglo in appearance and lacks any kind of accent. It seems clear that given these factors he would stay closer to the district than to the community, in clear contrast to his successor. His goals, too, were much more moderate than are the new project director's goals. He really seems to be oriented toward transition, that is, getting latino children sufficiently educated and socialized so they can fit into the Anglo community. This is very different from the new director's bicultural maintenance view.

The new project director has a Ph. D. in political science and has always taught political science at the college level. He was at first apprehensive about his new role. Now he finds himself on the firing line in the real world and he says he's never enjoyed himself so much in his life. He likes to characterize himself as an operator working within the community to bring about change in the school board. In particular, he seeks to assure continued development and long-term persistence of the Title VII project. He says that the superintendent uses him as a latino liaison in non-Title-VII matters also. As an example of how this might work, recently he was able to talk the superintendent into granting him another bicultural staff member. When the school bond election came around, the superintendent asked all administrators to work for a successful outcome. The Title VII project director responded by organizing the latino community in favor of the bond issue, which he did. Through techniques like this, the superintendent was able to get a 75 percent vote in favor of his bond issue, an unprecedented landslide for bond issues.

The project director said he works very closely with community representatives, and whenever possible tries to bring pressure to bear to get what he wants for latino children. It was clear from his descriptions that he is considerably more than a project director and probably does fulfill more the role of director of bilingual education in general, and ombudsman for latino students and citizens.

He described his role as that of weaning Grand Fork from federal money to support bilingual programs. He said he felt it was extremely important that these programs be funded locally. He said whenever possible he has tried to get local funding for bilingual projects. What he's trying to do is tie the community as closely as possible to the educational establishment so that the establishment will have made commitments to the community that will not end when and if federal money disappears. He feels that when the district itself is funding these projects there will be considerably more commitment than when the money is coming from outside sources. He sees himself as doing the P. R. and political work for the project, while his staff does curriculum-related things. He feels that this is a good arrangement because he does not have experience as a teacher or administrator.

His image of himself as a very successful advocate of latino rights was in contrast with the opinions of some other people. One district administrator complained that he tends to be too political; he aggressively seeks positions on the boards of various advocacy groups including the Latin American Council, which is thought by many to be unrepresentative of the local latino community, especially the old-line conservatives.

Two latino Bilingual Advisory Council members also expressed feelings that the project director was less effective than the previous project director. It seems clear, however, that the split may simply be ideological. The two were from the conservative sector of the community, had formerly served on the Latin American Council, but had been eased off recently because of their conservative stance. According to a member of the Latin American Council, the community is strongly behind the director, as he appears to be behind them.

Recruitment. The director of elementary instruction noted that initially it was very difficult to recruit bilingual bicultural teachers. Now they are able to get very good people, although a large proportion soon leave for better jobs or to enter Ph.D. programs. He says they "would like to hire a latino principal, and this has been suggested to the personnel department." The Grand Fork local teachers' union has been very sensitive to the needs for special material and the needs for balancing the ethnic characteristics of the staff, but they stand adamantly behind the Teachers' Agreement. This has greatly restricted the district's flexibility in reassigning positions in order to get a greater concentration of latino teachers in schools where there are latino students. This flexibility is additionally restricted by the fact that the school population is decreasing by about 600 kids per year.

An advisory council member agreed that recruitment is a problem because they can't seem to find enough interested people. He did say that the district is aggressive in seeking staff, and that the advisory council plays an active role in recommending persons.

It is interesting to note that these views seem to differ from those of the project director with respect to both the availability of candidates and the zeal with which the district tracks them down. The Latin American Council has been demanding a latino principal for four years, and it was only this year that the district agreed to meet this demand. Even so, they apparently did not do any kind of aggressive recruiting. The project director said he suspected that the district would make the commitment to hire a latino but not look for one, and then say they couldn't find one. So he took it upon himself to recruit latinos for the job. When asked how he had managed to recruit these people, he said, "I know where to look."

Intra-Staff Relations. An advisory council member noted that they had some real problems with school staff at first; it was the sort of "we don't like something we don't know" syndrome. But he feels that there has now been a change in the district, as people become more familiar with the needs and just how the bilingual project tries to meet those needs.

This year the project director says he has spent most of his time working at building bridges with teachers and principals and trying to get transfers for malcontents.

Some of the regular teaching staff at Werner School are becoming a little uneasy, because the regular enrollment is going down whereas the bused-in kids are making enrollment swell with latinos. This means that there is also a pressure for replacing regular teachers with latinos, or at least with bilingual teachers.

A member of the regular staff at one school, which is served by the mobile unit, had much criticism toward pullout programs in general and the bilingual bus in particular. At the time of our site visit, she had 28 students in her class, 5 of whom went to the bilingual bus. She found out which children would participate in the bilingual program when she received a list in her mailbox. There was no communication between project personnel and teachers. Her reaction to the project can best be characterized as absolute disgust, although this disgust is not limited to the bilingual project. She said that for her classes as a whole, 20 of them participate in projects outside the classroom so that in the afternoon her class size will vary anywhere from 28 to 8 children. Children come and go at all different times and stay away for varying periods of time. She said this makes it virtually impossible for her to carry out a coordinated and planned program for half of her teaching day. She thinks that some of these programs are beneficial to students, but she really didn't know how the bus was working because she had no idea what the project was trying to do. She said that she saw no difference in the five children who went to the bus from the beginning of the school year until the present. She felt that at least two or three of these children very much abused the privilege of going to the bus, staying out of the classroom anywhere from 30 minutes to almost an hour.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

The assistant director of elementary education commented on some of the impacts of the bilingual project. He said the project has sensitized non-project schools to the needs of the latino population, mostly by virtue of the propaganda efforts of the project director. The project has unified the community around Werner School. It has also interwoven with the district's Career Opportunities Program, in that a career ladder is set up for bilingual aides that will eventually end at teacher certification.

In a sense, the elementary and secondary divisions of the district have been brought closer together because of the need to work on the problem. The project has reinforced their commitment to individualize instruction.

The principal of Taylor School noted the more pragmatic result that the school's dropout rate has decreased.

Our National Opinion Research Center questionnaires indicated that the project had disseminated to nearby school districts, but the project director was evasive about the extent of direct impact on those programs.

Since the Title VII funding has run only two years, it is probably too soon to speculate on the project's persistence after federal funding ends. Except for the small teacher ratios, however, the prognosis is generally favorable, especially since the project developed before federal funding was applied for. In the meantime, the project will address itself to meeting changing needs during the remaining three years of federal funding.

Elementary Level

One dimension of the changing needs is the growing dispersion of the latino target group around the city; whereas before they seemed to be concentrated in the Werner School attendance area, they now are dispersing. If continuation funding is granted in 1974-75, the project will initiate bilingual classrooms in another elementary school.

Continuation funding will also provide an improved mobile classroom. Several administrators said they look for a unit, along the dimensions of a mobile home, that is more comfortable and adequately heated. Such a unit would be used for adult and summer programs as well as the present mobile program. The project director wants to get this locally funded in order to assure that the school board is committed to its purpose.

He will try to move the program back to team teaching (pairing one bilingual teacher with a monolingual English-speaking teacher), at least at the elementary level. He also wants to give teachers training during the summer in biculturalism and in teaching bilingual education.

He says there is a need to develop a bilingual individualized instruction program, but so far has avoided the obvious ally in such a project, the director for contracted learning, who complains that she would like to get together with him and talk out the program but can't seem to get him cornered. She would like to develop, or have developed, a diagnostic/prescriptive instructional model for the bilingual program patterned after the rather elaborate model she devised for two experimental schools in the district. The project director is turned off by the district's existing individualized learning packages which, in his words, equate merely to "progressing at your own speed." His views on this topic will be explored in more detail in a later section.

Finally, it appears reasonably certain that Werner School will have a latino principal next year.

Junior High

The principal described some changes he will institute at Taylor Junior High next year. He said the kids presently don't like the program because they feel that it is demeaning to be in a self-contained classroom like elementary or special-education students for half-days.

Accordingly, next year he will schedule all students in the building into a regular six-classes-per-day schedule. Then, for example, if a student comes to a science class and can't speak English, he will be temporarily reprogrammed into a resource center for four days out of the week. In the resource center there will be three bilingual staff members: one concentrating on math and science, one concentrating on English and reading, and one who concentrates on social and heritage problems. On the fifth day the student would go back to the regular classroom where he would sit with a student tutor-companion. This way he might at least feel as if he were in the regular program, and hopefully as the year goes by he would spend fewer days in the resource center and more in the regular program as his English improved. In this way, each kid would have a six-class day, and perhaps there would be less stigma.

Senior High

No program is presently planned for the high school. The high school's apparent attitude at this point is that they have no problem in regard to bilingual education and do not need such a program. The reason, according to one person, is that the dropout rate among latinos is so high that students with a language problem rarely survive as far as high school.

However, if the bilingual program succeeds in cutting down on the dropout rate of latino students, then the high school will one day have to deal with them. Additionally, the bilingual program will be producing students who have had a good deal of Spanish before they enter high school. This will be particularly true for latino students who will have studied grammar and other aspects of Spanish in junior high. The Spanish language program at the high school will have to be revised to include such students.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Initiation/Implementation/Impacts

Latinos comprise 2 or 3 percent of the Grand Fork public school population, but their diversity (Cuban, Dominican, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican) presents special problems in designing an appropriate curriculum. The school district is up to the challenge, but perceptions of success vary. The district has a wide array of educational interventions, and in this context the bilingual education project has been generally well-received. Another situation that has been conducive for the project was the advent of a change-oriented superintendent. Three community informants characterized him and his deputy as being very willing to listen to community special interests, a characteristic that apparently was harder to find in previous school administrations.

The district initiated special treatment for latinos in 1967, in the form of a limited ESL program at Werner School. The program was slow to expand until the summer of 1971 when a district bilingual coordinator was hired. He was charismatic, and allegedly was able to pull the community out of their closets Pied Piper style. Part of his job description was to solicit bilingual education funding. In the winter of 1971, he and two other persons wrote the initial Title VII proposal.

The bilingual project began in the fall of 1972 at Werner Elementary School, which had the highest concentration of latinos. The project served grades K-3 in rather typical self-contained (except for bilingual instruction) classrooms. There was a pullout room for kids who needed ESL or who had special remedial problems. Not all teachers were bilingual, but this was remedied by teaming monolingual-English and bilingual teachers.

Halfway through the first year, the bilingual coordinator quit, and in May the district, which was about to hire an Anglo director, was persuaded by the local Latin American Council to hire a latino political scientist.

In the fall of 1973, a mobile unit was furbished to provide pullout bilingual education services to other elementary schools with latino concentrations. The program at Werner School expanded to the 4th grade, but became somewhat less "bilingual" with the termination of team teaching and the departmentalization of SSL (provided by an itinerant teacher) and ESL (provided in the pullout room).

The program also expanded to Taylor Junior High in 1973, after the Taylor principal modified the existing remedial reading and math program to qualify under Title VII funding. Participants are scheduled in the program for a three-hour block, during which one hour is devoted to each of math, reading, and ESL. Little cross-cultural exposure is incorporated. Project teachers are bilingual, but the math and reading curriculum is individualized, and apparently only the latinos are instructed bilingually. The project model at Taylor is very transition-oriented.

Teacher recruitment has been a major difficulty for the project. The district must go out of state to find certified bilingual teachers, and the hirees are therefore generally more career-bound than place-bound. District officials complain that the better teachers are quickly lured away by better jobs or Ph. D. programs. There is also some friction with regular staff. The monolingual teachers at Werner are uneasy because the proportion of latinos at that school is increasing through busing, and they fear they may be replaced; the concern is legitimate, since the principal will be replaced by a latino next year. Also, there was at least one very bitter complaint by a regular teacher at one of the schools served by the bilingual bus; she claimed that the bus operation, along with the other special pullout programs foisted by the district, made it impossible for her to organize a coherent classroom instruction program.

There are mixed feelings about the appropriateness of materials at both Werner and Taylor. Interestingly, the Anglos generally think they are very good, and the latinos generally feel they are less than good. The latino complaint is that the materials do not adequately respond to differences between Anglo and latino cultures, let alone the differences within the latino group.

There is an advisory council of teachers, parents, and community representatives, which apparently has not had a great deal of policy input into the project. The parents in particular seldom attend the meetings, which tend to be awkwardly scheduled. The two leaders of the council, who are also leaders of the community's conservative latino faction, expressed much efficacy in dealing with the district; they have plans for an enlarged and more influential bilingual advisory council. The Latin American Council (LAC), which has no formal affiliation with the schools, also claims efficacy in influencing the district. The new project director actively uses the LAC (which represents the city's "liberal" latino faction) as a political base for enhancing project permanence.

At the time of the fieldwork, there had been no assessment of cognitive impacts of the bilingual project, except that Spanish reading scores turned in by Anglo kids at Werner school were higher than expected. District officials do claim impacts along less measurable dimensions, such as sensitization of staff to latino needs, lower dropout rates at Taylor school, and some mobilization of latino interest in education affairs.

Dissemination/Continuation

The Grand Fork bilingual project has apparently had some influence on the design of the pending bilingual programs in nearby districts. There have also been visitors from other communities in the state. Within the district, there is some utilization of the project as a resource center by teachers from schools not served by the project. Next year (1974-75) bilingual classrooms will be initiated in a second elementary school, and the bilingual bus component will be expanded. Both of these developments will be contingent on increased Title VII funding, however.

Although it is a little premature to speculate, the project will probably be continued after the termination of federal funding, but with larger pupil-teacher ratios. The project director is carefully laying political groundwork toward this end. One danger is that the project director does not have a tight grip on project curriculum matters, and the project which is eventually institutionalized may be very different from the current project description.

Project Politics

The most interesting aspect of the Grand Fork fieldwork was the contrast between the two project directors and how their different styles interacted with the mild intrigues and private agendas that appear to be operative in the district and latino community. The fact that private agendas seemed so observable in the short site-visit period is a tribute to midwestern candor.

District Leadership. The superintendent was hired four years ago with instructions to shake things up, which he did. He has a management style that includes trading favors and subtly playing one subordinate against another, but carefully within limits of legitimacy. At the same time, he has a reputation for fairness and for dealing honestly with the community. He is very popular with the minority communities. One of his first unprecedented actions was to hire a local black as his deputy. Both he and the deputy have reputations for accessibility, which apparently is also unprecedented.

District Staff. Most of the mid-level district staff are old-line survivors. The staff seem to be uniformly change-oriented, but are traditionally very competitive. There is a tendency to try to out-innovate each other. On the one hand, staff members are well-meaning (i. e., pupil-oriented), mutually proud of the district's accomplishments, and share a sense of establishment. On the other hand, there is frequent disagreement on the proper means to any given end, and a lot of civilized in-fighting. Much energy seems to be expended in resisting each other's influence.

Latino Community. The latino community divides into two factions: conservatives, who tend to be the more affluent and established residents; and liberals, who tend to be the new arrivals. In the sixties, the conservative faction established the Latin American Council (LAC), primarily as a referral organization. Four years ago, the liberal faction wrested control, and the council became more action-oriented. The conservatives attempted to regain influence by instituting voting reforms, but were unsuccessful.

Two years ago, the Bilingual Advisory Council (BAC) was formed, with membership determined by district personnel. The chairman of BAC was one of the disenfranchised founders of the LAC. At the time of the site visit, she was planning to appoint another LAC founder as her cochairman. Together, they are planning to strengthen the BAC membership with affluent influentials, that is, the kind of persons who are most effective under the conservative model of change. It is also possible that they are seeking a political forum to represent the disenfranchised conservative faction. Lest this judgment seem harsh, it should be noted that, like the district staff, both latino factions generally seek similar ends, through differing means. The liberals prefer confrontation politics, presumably because that is where nonaffluents and new arrivals can be most effective. The conservatives have some leverage "within the system," and that is where they prefer to work.

Project Directors. The first project director has been described as charismatic, handsome, charming, etc. He also has somewhat Anglo features and no trace of accent. He enjoyed strong support from the district mid-level staff. Reports of support from the community are equivocal; the conservatives say definitely yes, the liberals say he didn't relate too well. There is no doubt that both factions were quick to appreciate that his influence with district leadership was unusual for a latino. He felt he was personally most effective by adopting a rather narrow focus on bilingual education, transition-oriented at that. He avoided other latino concerns, except as dispassionate liaison between district and community. He viewed himself as a professional educator.

The present project director is squarely Tex-Mex Chicano. He apparently enjoys effective access to the superintendent. Mid-level staff, on the other hand, have distaste for his nongenteel involvement in community action politics, particularly the low-life Latin American Council; they feel this is conduct unbecoming a professional educator, and seem to be chagrined that he is often successful in his objectives. The conservative latinos are not pleased with him, probably largely because he prefers working with the action-oriented liberals. The liberal latinos, of course, are pleased. He is a political scientist with no previous experience in public schools. He views institutionalization of bilingual education as a political problem, and feels that his self-described role as politician is essential. His focus is wide because he feels that the success of his project is inexorably contingent on wider latino concerns. He eagerly plays advocate in community politics.

The present director presents an unusual model for project directorship. He also may be headed for a crashing fall. He has alienated many influential people; much depends on his continued direct relationship with the superintendent. He seems to thrive on the risky situation and is not too interested in compromising his style to play it safe. After all, he can always go back to college teaching.

Annex

ON ISSUES RELATED TO BILINGUAL EDUCATION

IMPORTANCE OF BICULTURAL TEACHERS

The distinction between bilingualism and biculturalism was repeatedly emphasized by the project director. He said that it was not enough that a teacher be able to talk to a student in Spanish.

For one thing, an Anglo teacher would not be sensitive to the nuances of language that differed between Spanish speakers of Cuban, Dominican, and Mexican-American background. Anglo teachers who spoke Spanish would also have considerable difficulty including cultural differences in the curriculum.* The project director feels that inclusion and awareness of these cultural differences are important, and that it is necessary to be cognizant of them in developing a curriculum that is suitable for latino children. For example, he said that latino culture is not nearly so competitive as Anglo culture; cooperation is more highly valued. Many of the new curricula being developed require children to be competitive in order to succeed in the curriculum.

He said another very important aspect of bilingual education has to do with self-esteem. The uniqueness of bilingual curricula is important not only so that they may be tailored to the cultural needs of the child, but also because it increases a child's self-esteem if he's not just getting translated copies of what the other children have.

Another factor that he felt to be important in bilingual education was the notion of personal space. Latino children are much more likely to want to touch the teacher and to be touched by her. At the same time, out of respect, they're much less likely to maintain eye contact with the teacher. But the teacher who is not versed in latino culture may assume that the latino child who is not looking at her is not paying attention.

Another thing that a teacher must realize in teaching latino students is that they are trained very early to respect authority. This makes it very hard for them to question the teacher or to challenge the things that may be presented. If this sort of questioning and challenge is required in the curriculum, latino children will surely suffer.

---

*It is interesting that the persons on his project who have the strongest roles in designating curriculum (the curriculum coordinator at Werner School, the principal at Taylor, and the bilingual specialist) are all Anglo. The director admits to having a small curriculum input, and the other latinos are all classroom teachers or aides.

TEACHER TRAINING

The deputy superintendent came on strongly in favor of having Title VII place a commitment for some kind of training package for staff. He feels that Title VII needs a program something like the Career Opportunities Program (COP), which helps support the training of people who can't study full time because of personal economics and situations. The LEA could then develop a homegrown staff. Grand Fork, for example, would not have to rely on Texans who don't like the weather, don't particularly relate to the community, and who typically do not stay in the school system for a very long time. There needs to be more natural incentive to keep staff involved in a program.

For example, he would like to see the district provide ten outstanding Grand Fork high school graduates with $2000 loans, with payback forgiveness if they return to the community. Similar to the old NDEA loans, the more years that the recipient spent in the school district after graduation from college the less he would have to pay back.

He would also like to see in-service for nonprogram people as well as program people. Grand Fork has experienced a couple of dramatic turnabouts where regular staff persons who were resistant and opposed to the bilingual program suddenly became supportive when they were exposed to an in-service program or a regional workshop for bilingual programs.

Finally, he advised that if the district thinks that they can carry on by bending a rule or two, for example with respect to certification, then the federal program office ought to support it. He believes there needs to be a more pragmatic approach, because of the nonordinary qualities that are required for teachers in a bilingual program.

SPECIAL BILINGUAL NEEDS IN THE MIDWEST

The director of special programs feels that the federal Title VII program office puts the Midwest down because of the small absolute numbers in the target population. He feels they should consider that, in many senses, the latino has much greater problems in the Midwest than in the Southwest. For example, in Grand Fork, there is no "Se Habla Espanol" on storefronts and government offices. He said that virtually no bilingual people work in government offices or hospitals in Grand Fork. It is fairly clear that monolingual people have to learn English very quickly in order to survive in the community. Also, latinos cannot so easily return to a barrio as is the case in the Southwest, the West, or even in the East. The fact that the latinos in the Midwest tend to be more dispersed and less concentrated in barrios makes the problem of serving the special needs of these people much greater for city and school administrators.

The project director stated that these same characteristics make the Midwest an exciting place to do bilingual projects because there is considerably more potential for dynamic programs. He thinks that any innovation in bilingual education will come from the Midwest, because the West and Southwest are locked in institutionally, whereas the Midwest is change-oriented. He says that the latino population in Grand Fork comprises 4 percent of the total population, yet he is able to get more response from the school establishment than, for example, would be forthcoming in Texas communities where the Chicano population is 50 or 60 percent.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS

On the subject of institutionalization of special projects into the regular school instruction format, the director of contracted education felt that one could probably never institutionalize special projects completely because building principals are typically too harried to handle the diversity presented by such projects. For this reason, she believes that special projects should stay out of the instruction division of the school district, but stay indefinitely within compensatory education, special programs, or some similar school division where the project can be represented by a special advocate at the district level and thereby have the capability of effectively cutting through red tape when necessary. Otherwise, she feels that a very strong person would be needed at the school level, someone like a good reading specialist who is also a good project pusher.

One teacher who complained about the bilingual bus would disagree on the grounds that such a system might spawn an army of red-tape cutters who wreak havoc on the classroom teachers' efforts to create a coherent classroom experience.

The project director would probably reply that the organizational structure for managing special projects is secondary to the need for securing local funding as soon as possible. His strategy has two fronts. One is to work the community up to a combative awareness so that it would strongly resist any move to drop the bilingual program. The other front is to take every opportunity to tie nonlocal school funding sources to the goodwill of the community or results of the bilingual project (note that this excludes funding for the project itself), so that the school board would be aware that certain funding would cease if the project were dropped. For example, much of the district's state funding depends on ADA, and dropout prevention is one goal of the project.

CULTURAL BIAS IN CONVENTIONAL INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

The project director was upset with the individualized reading/math program being used at Taylor and Werner. He believes that contingency management, which is the backbone of this program, is bad for latinos because culturally they're not into competition, but rather cooperation. He said that for this program, as for many other programs that claim to offer individualized instruction, the only individualized aspect of the instruction is that children can move forward at varying speeds. He feels that individualized instruction should have a more profound focus on meeting the needs of the kids, especially if used for bilingual instruction where there are such large cultural differences.

He claims that the district staff won't ask for his input because he is too subjective. He admits to not knowing a great deal about this program, but he comments that when he goes to the "reward" room, he notices that 80 percent of the students in that room are Anglos, who are actually a minority in the program. To him it looks as if the program has set up another failure situation for latinos.

CONCERNS OVER SEGREGATION SUITS

The assistant superintendent for instruction expressed concern that the district was necessarily concentrating latino kids at Werner School in order to obtain a critical mass for a viable bilingual program. In effect, he is apprehensive that years from now this may be viewed as segregation, and he is still bristling over the recent NAACP suit against the district for segregating blacks. He says he has worked closely with the judge with respect to the bilingual project situation, but about the only advice he gets is that he has to do whatever seems most appropriate at the time.

Four or five years ago the NAACP sued the district over segregation in the schools. Last year a decision on the case was finally handed down in which it was decided to desegregate the school staff instead of the students. Unfortunately, teachers were reassigned on the basis of race and lack of seniority; this had the effect of dispersing the hot shots who had been assigned to special programs at certain schools. This was a bad blow to several programs, but it may have also been a positive force for spreading interest in the programs around the district; as the hot shots were dispersed they took their ideas with them.